

University of Louisville

ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

5-2013

Exploring the missing pieces : readers, religion and societal relations in ONE magazine, 1954-1963.

Alisha West
University of Louisville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

West, Alisha, "Exploring the missing pieces : readers, religion and societal relations in ONE magazine, 1954-1963." (2013). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 1551.
<https://doi.org/10.18297/etd/1551>

This Master's Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. This title appears here courtesy of the author, who has retained all other copyrights. For more information, please contact thinkir@louisville.edu.

EXPLORING THE MISSING PIECES: READERS, RELIGION AND SOCIETAL
RELATIONS IN ONE MAGAZINE, 1954-1963

By

Alisha West
B.A., Gonzaga University, 2010

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of the
College of Arts and Sciences of the University of Louisville
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Department of Women's and Gender Studies
University of Louisville
Louisville, KY

May 2013

EXPLORING THE MISSING PIECES: READERS, RELIGION AND SOCIETAL
RELATIONS IN ONE MAGAZINE, 1954-1963

By

Alisha West
B.A., Gonzaga University, 2010

A Thesis Approved on

April 23, 2013

by the following Thesis Committee:

Dr. Nancy Theriot
Thesis Director

Dr. Kaila Story

Dr. Anne Caldwell

ABSTRACT

EXPLORING THE MISSING PIECES: READERS, RELIGION AND SOCIETAL RELATIONS IN ONE MAGAZINE, 1954-1963

Alisha West

April 26, 2013

ONE was the first well-known gay and lesbian magazine published in the United States. This study examined the contents of *ONE* magazine, from January 1954 to December 1963, to determine if certain themes were present. These topics were stated in the form of questions: What causes homosexuality? Should homosexuals embrace "swish"? What is the homosexual's relationship to societal authorities? What is the role of religion in the homosexual's life? Are there connections between homosexuals over time and in different cultures? How does the homosexual fit into society? The results of the study indicate that scholars who have previously researched *ONE* discussed the two topics that arise most often in *ONE*: Should homosexuals embrace "swish" and what is the homosexual's relationship to societal authorities? The latter was a theme that was discussed three times more than any of the other seven identified themes. Two of the other topics occurred nearly as often as "should homosexuals embrace 'swish'" but have not yet discussed in other literature on this subject. These topics are: What is the role of religion in a homosexual's life and how does the homosexual fit into society? This thesis discusses those topics in detail. Additionally, this study included an analysis of the letters readers of the magazine wrote to the editors. The results show that some of the readers' interests were not adequately addressed in the articles of *ONE*; namely, readers were more concerned with loneliness/isolation and with "swish" behavior.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ABSTRACT.....	iii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
The Significance of <i>ONE</i>	3
The Study of <i>ONE</i> : Methodology.....	5
The Content of <i>ONE</i>	9
The Truth of <i>ONE</i>	13
CHAPTER 1: ONE UPON A TIME: A BRIEF HISTORY OF <i>ONE</i> MAGAZINE.....	15
<i>ONE</i> 's Connection to Mattachine.....	28
CHAPTER 2: RELIGION IN <i>ONE</i>	34
<i>ONE</i> Reports Official Statements from Authorities.....	36
<i>ONE</i> 's Response to Official Statements.....	37
<i>ONE</i> 's Response to Christian Ideology.....	38
<i>ONE</i> 's Fighting Words.....	41
<i>ONE</i> 's Writers Who Found Organized Religion Wanting.....	42
<i>ONE</i> 's Book Reviews & Religion.....	45
Conclusion.....	47
CHAPTER 3: THE HOMOPHILE IN A HETEROSEXUAL WORLD.....	49
Should a homophile marry a member of the opposite sex?.....	51
Should homosexuals "marry" each other?.....	52

Can homosexuals be parents?.....	55
Are there options other than "marriage" for homosexuals?.....	57
How do homosexuals meet each other?.....	58
<i>ONE's</i> Successful Homosexuals.....	61
Conclusion.....	62
CHAPTER 4: THE READERS OF <i>ONE</i>	64
The Readers and Religion.....	66
The Readers and their Place in Society.....	70
To Swish or Not to Swish, is that the Question?.....	77
The Magazine Belongs to You: Conversation Blooms.....	79
The Magazine Belongs to You: Praise and Criticism.....	81
The Magazine Belongs to You: Support and Suggestions.....	85
The Magazine Belongs to You: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly.....	87
Take <i>ONE</i> Down and Pass It Around.....	89
Conclusion.....	89
CONCLUSION.....	91
REFERENCES.....	95
APPENDIX A: PSEUDONYMS.....	98
APPENDIX B: <i>ONE'S</i> ARTICLES.....	100
APPENDIX C: BOOK REVIEWS.....	106
APPENDIX D: <i>ONE'S</i> LETTERS.....	107
APPENDIX E: NON-FICTION ARTICLES V. LETTERS.....	110
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	111

INTRODUCTION

Historians such as John D’Emilio, Larry Gross, Martin Meeker, and Rodger Streitmatter have studied what has been termed the “homophile movement” because they consider the work done in this era a precursor to gay liberation movement that began in late 1960s and continued through the 1970s. Most historians of 1950s and 60s homophile movement believe that, even though their activism did not include the types of militant protest that arose later in the century, the men and women of this time period were still activists working to end the oppression of homosexuals. In the 1950s, homosexual acts were illegal in every state, punishments for being caught in a homosexual act sometimes included castration (especially for those in prison) and/or, more often, imprisonment (sometimes for a life sentence); and, becoming known as a homosexual most often led to the loss of a job (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 40; Streitmatter 35). All of this considered, the work that these men and women did so openly was courageous.

This thesis is an analysis of themes in *ONE*, a homophile publication of the mid-twentieth century. Historians of sexuality have paid some attention to *ONE*; however, my thesis will examine neglected currents of thought in the magazine and will conclude that *ONE*’s writers and readers offer new insights to the homophile period. Before introducing the framework of the thesis, I want to clarify terminology and a guiding concept. Terminology can be problematic when discussing historic time periods. It can be

especially problematic when it comes to an evolving group such as the LGBTQI community. John Denner Master II explains the problem in his thesis when he argues that the word "gay" should not be used when describing the homophile movement as it is not a term they used in the time period (Master 294). Though I disagree with Master about use of the word "gay" during this time period (it was used often and Chuck Rowland, an activist of the time period, says that they were using the term as far back as the 1930s and everyone knew it meant homosexual), I understand his point—it is important to use historically accurate terminology in historical works (Marcus 33). Today, very few LGBTQI individuals would use the term "homosexual" to describe their sexuality. The term "homosexual" is even problematic for the time period because it was appropriated from medical discourse that often viewed same sex sexuality as an illness in need of a cure. Still, it is the term that was used most often in *ONE*. Therefore, I will use the term "homosexual" more often than "homophile" or "gay" in this thesis because this was the term used most often in *ONE* magazine during the 1950s and early 60s, though both of the other terms were used as well and interchangeably with "homosexual." Finally, I use the term LGBTQI a few times in this thesis purposefully. *ONE* magazine contains the history of men, women, and intersexed individuals in each of the categories of this acronym. Though the vast majority of the articles were for gay men, less often lesbians, and rarely the other categories, they are all mentioned in *ONE*. The history that LGBTQI individuals can claim as their own began earlier than most realize.

The guiding concept used by many scholars of this era is identity formation. Dennis Altman, C. Todd White, D'Emilio, Gross, and Master, among other scholars, concur that the homophiles' most important contribution to LGBTQI liberation history

was building a sense of community, or shared identity, among men and women often isolated from one another geographically, ideologically, emotionally, psychologically, etc. D’Emilio explains, “Before a movement could take shape, that process had to be far enough along so that at least some gay women and men could perceive themselves as members of an oppressed minority, sharing an identity that subjected them to systematic injustice” (4). Gross specifically cites the lesbian and gay press and the medium through which awareness of a shared identity was spread (21). These historians claim that Stonewall did not arise in a vacuum: it was the product of a growing awareness of the shared oppression faced by all homosexuals. At many points, this thesis illustrates places where the idea is evident in *ONE*. However, there are also moments when the writers and readers of *ONE* reject the idea that their sexuality might constitute an identity in the more modern sense of the word. A better word to describe the growth that occurred during this time period might be "community." *ONE* helped develop within the homophile population a feeling of community or connection. Understanding that “identity” is a troubling concept, I employ it in various places in the thesis.

The Significance of *ONE*

When it comes to the homophile movement, the Mattachine Society has received the majority of the attention by historians. Indeed, the Society’s contribution to LGBTQ history cannot be overstated. However, when it comes to the homosexual press in the homophile era, *ONE* was the clear leader. The founders of *ONE* magazine also created a corporation called ONE, Inc. that did much more than publish the magazine. The activities they sponsored are discussed in more detail in Chapter 1. From this point on I will refer to *ONE* Magazine using italics, and ONE, Inc. without italics in order to differentiate between the two.

ONE magazine was illustrated (sometimes photography was included); and, it was professionally typeset and printed. It contained more general interest articles than *Mattachine Review* or *The Ladder* for two main reasons: First, *Mattachine Review's* content was primarily articles by scientific "experts" while *ONE's* leaders believed that homosexuals are the real experts about their lives and printed mostly articles by laymen (though not exclusively); second, *The Ladder* was written solely for lesbians while *ONE* tried--their success in this area is debatable--to create a magazine for all homosexuals, male and female (Streitmatter 23-30, 38; D'Emilio 116, 125; "Editorial" Jul. 1958 *ONE* 4). Additionally, its circulation was higher than *Mattachine Review* or *The Ladder* combined.¹ Finally, the bravery they exhibited in the court case against the United States Post Office and the impact that had on the freedom of the gay press is of significant historical note. Without the favorable decision rendered to *ONE* by the United States Supreme Court, it may not have been able to keep publishing a magazine that was

¹ D'Emilio reports that *ONE* had a circulation of 5,000, *Mattachine Review* 2,200, and *The Ladder* 500 (D'Emilio 110). Unfortunately, he uses numbers from different years for each magazine and confuses *subscriptions* with *circulation*. The number of subscribers was always much smaller but was supplemented by distribution through newsstands, bookstores, and other sales. 5,000 was the circulation for *ONE* in 1954. The source he used for *Mattachine Review* was from a meeting of their board of directors in 1960. This number must have been their circulation because *Mattachine Review* never had that many subscribers. However, he gets his number for *The Ladder* from the number of surveys they sent to their *subscribers* in 1958--their circulation would have been higher. Streitmatter's numbers and sources are even more puzzling. He claims that *ONE* had 5,000 subscribers, *Mattachine Review* had 1,000, and *The Ladder* had 700 (Streitmatter 28). The endnote contains no further information than he got these circulation numbers from Alan Winter's dissertation, D'Emilio's book cited above, and interviews with Jim Kepner. Obviously, these are not examples of excellent scholarship. More trustworthy are the subscription numbers White found in the corporation records of ONE, Inc. though they are scattered throughout his book. The highest number of *subscriptions* was 1650 in 1954 and the lowest was below 900 in 1958 (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 70, 88). However, when sales through newsstands and other venues are included, circulation in 1953 was 1515 (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 53). It jumped all the way to 5,000 by 1954 (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 53, 70). It fell to an all-time low in 1958 but, unfortunately, that number is not given (White 88). But 1960 it had jumped back up to 3,805 (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 99). Adding to this confusion is the fact that readership was far larger than these numbers suggest because homosexuals across the country passed them back and forth through their networks (D'Emilio 110). Though attempting to find distribution numbers this many years later is like trying to put together a puzzle that is missing dozens of pieces, two things are clear: *ONE* was more popular than the other two magazines and it touched the lives of thousands of homosexuals, both in the United States and around the world.

helping the homosexual population become aware of one another. Furthermore, if *ONE* had lost their court case, later magazines that were even more militant and controversial, such as *The Advocate*, may have had an even more difficult time publishing, if they could have continued at all.

Mattachine Society and the Daughters of Bilitis (D.O.B.) have been criticized by D’Emilio and Streitmatter for their “assimilationist” policies; even though Meeker comes to their defense in his book *Contacts Desired: Gay and Lesbian Communications and Community, 1940s – 1970s*, it is largely undisputed that *ONE* was the only magazine of the time period that really seemed to openly advocate for homosexual rights and convey what D’Emilio has called “combative pride” or Master terms “proto-pride” (D’Emilio 89; Master 204). At the very least, the claim that “Long before asserting pride in gayness became the standard rallying cry of homosexual political organizing, *ONE* incorporated into its editorial tone an unapologetic sense of self-acceptance” is true (Master 339). If D’Emilio is correct when he asserts that “a shared group identity” is the cornerstone of any social movement, *ONE*’s insistence that the homosexual has a legitimate place in society was an important step toward building a homosexual community. Even though it has been given a somewhat secondary position by prominent historians, *ONE* was integral to the homophile movement and the gay liberation movement that came later; without this magazine or another like it, the gay liberation movement may not have happened. The men and women who created *ONE*, the magazine itself, and the actions of *ONE*, Inc. deserve sustained interest. Like Master’s 2006 dissertation, this thesis focuses on the magazine itself, but the larger story of *ONE* is truly just beginning to be told.

The Study of *ONE*: Methodology

C. Todd White, in his in-depth analysis of the history of *ONE*, splits the history of the magazine into three periods which I find very useful. The first period was the first year of publication, in which Martin Block and Dale Jennings were editors of *ONE* magazine. The second was the most stable period which began in February 1954 when Dorr Legg, *ONE*'s acting business manager, took leadership of the corporation. During this time period, the two most important editors on *ONE*'s staff were Don Slater and Jim Kepner. White believes that Kepner's resignation caused a crisis in *ONE*'s leadership and ushered in the third era which was characterized by infighting between Dorr Legg and Don Slater.² I will argue that though there was obviously animosity between the leader of *ONE*, Inc. and the editor of *ONE* Magazine, it did not become extremely intense until the January 1954 meeting of the Board of Directors (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 122-128). Then, when Legg met millionaire Reed Erickson in July 1954 and established a stable source of funding, he knew that he no longer needed the revenue generated by *ONE* magazine and could therefore take control over the magazine without bothering to deal with the editor's complaints (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 126-127). Thus, while White understands that the second period in *ONE*'s history ends with Jim Kepner's resignation at the end of 1960, I argue that the magazine remained stable for at least three more years. The only change in the content of the magazine was a slight increase in fiction items which may not have

² I won't go into details about Kepner's resignation in this short history, but he was a very important member of the editorial staff for years. White gives him credit for the stability between Legg and Slater during the stable period of *ONE*'s history (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 102). This is likely because Kepner, in some ways, agreed with both men about their goals for *ONE*. Like Legg he taught at *ONE* Institute and believed that *ONE Quarterly* was a necessary publication even though it cost more to produce than it ever came close to making (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 87). However, like Slater he was totally committed to *ONE* magazine, he was an editor and primary contributor for a decade, believing in it as a tool for change. He explains that he quit primarily because Legg failed to file the correct paperwork for tax-exempt status. When the IRS began to send threatening letters to Kepner personally, he decided to sever ties with *ONE*, Inc. He also says that he was having clashes with Legg over editing *Quarterly* (Kepner *Rough News* 395).

been noticeable to *ONE*'s readers. The letters printed in the "Letters" column from 1961-63 indicate that most readers were still interested and engaged in the magazine. I believe that the real period of stability lasted for a decade, from February 1954 to December 1963. The final period began with the January board meetings in 1964 and lasted until the Slater's attempted coup in April 1965 (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 134-135). Each of these periods will be discussed in more detail in the first chapter, but my analysis is based only on the most stable period between 1954 and 1963.

This thesis answers many of my original research question. First, I wanted to analyze the contents of *ONE* to determine if the themes that other scholars have identified as dominating the content of *ONE* can accurately be said to have been a significant portion of its content. Second, I wondered if there were any other themes that recurred often enough to be significant, but have not yet been thoroughly analyzed. Third, I was curious to see if the readers of *ONE* (using their letters) were concerned about different issues than were the editors and contributors of *ONE*'s articles. Finally, I wanted to know if, in these various discussions, the growing sense of community that so many scholars consider important to social movements can be seen.

To begin, I studied the secondary literature and read each issue (available to me) from January 1954-1963,³ making notes on the topics discussed in each non-fiction article. I identified seven themes; three of which other scholars have discussed often and four of which have been mostly overlooked. These themes were: causes of

³ There are a few issues missing from the collection of *ONE* available in the University of Louisville special collections. According to White, August and September 1954 were never created. October 1954 was an issue that *ONE* later sued the Post Office for refusing to mail so they are difficult to come by. April 1955, the combined April and May 1956, April 1957, July 1959, and February 1962 are missing. It is possible that April 1955 was never created because White explains that *ONE* routinely missed certain months between 1954 and 1957, due to troubles with their process (White 89).

homosexuality; "swish" behavior; women in *ONE*; repudiation of societal authorities; religion; homosexual connections over time and culture; and the homosexual's place in society.⁴

I made the decision not to analyze the topics of the fiction pieces for many reasons. First, *ONE* was advised by their attorney not to print fiction in the magazine but the editors included it because they didn't have enough content to fill a full issue (Streitmatter 35). Also, even though many of the readers seemed to enjoy the short stories and poetry, numerous readers sent letters voicing their opinions that *ONE*'s fiction was not high quality. Finally, fiction is much more subjective than non-fiction and my goal for this study is to be sure about the themes discussed. None of this is to say that the fiction contained in *ONE* was unimportant. In fact, it was two of the fiction pieces that led the U.S. Post Office to confiscate the October 1954 issue, leading to the court battle that arguable changed the tide of gay journalism forever. Between 1954 and 1963, short stories and poems made up 32.27% of the articles in *ONE*. Fiction is obviously a significant enough feature of *ONE* to merit attention and it is my hope that many scholars focus on it in the future. However, for the purposes of this study, it was best to use only on the non-fiction articles.

Between 1954 and 1963, non-fiction articles accounted for 67.73% of the articles in *ONE*, a substantial majority of its content. I was able to analyze 678 articles for their themes, the majority of which were recurring columns in the magazine. In fact, 42% of the non-fiction articles were devoted to recurring items such as editorials, book reviews, news stories, and letters from readers. The dialogue between the editors and the readers in

⁴ See Appendix B for the number of articles engaging in these conversations.

the "Letters" columns is an important point of my analysis and is a piece of *ONE* that no scholar has yet evaluated in-depth.⁵

The Content of *ONE*

ONE is often discussed in books and articles concerning the homophile movement. As early as 1971, histories of the early gay and lesbian movements began to appear. Most, like Barry Adam's *The Rise of a Gay and Lesbian Movement*, begin with the homophile movement but quickly move on to the gay liberation movement that started around 1969. A few, such as John D'Emilio's *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities: The Making of a Homosexual Minority in the United States, 1940-1970*, focus most of their attention on the homophile period. It is important to note, however, that much of this work was written before many of the corporation documents were formally archived and available to researchers which led to certain notable errors.⁶ For

⁵ Tables of these findings and many more can be found in Appendix B.

Also interesting to note is that a third of the articles were written by *ONE*'s staff, though this would have been unknown to the average reader because of the heavy use of pseudonyms by *ONE*'s staff. A full list of these names can be found in Appendix A. Jim Kepner wrote under five different names. There are entire issues where he wrote almost all of the non-fiction content himself but no one would have known it at the time (see the combined August and September 1956 issue or the May 1958 issue for examples). Dorr Legg wrote under just as many different names and often dominated the content of *ONE* as well. Additionally, there was a list of names that anyone on staff was allowed to write under including Robert Gregory, Del McIntire, Marvin Cutler, and Alison Hunter. When articles written by these authors appear, it is difficult to know who really wrote the article. Sometimes the use of pen names caused problems for the staff. For instance, Sten Russell resigned after she discovered that Dorr Legg wrote an article under the name Alison Hunter arguing that lesbianism is a good form of birth control (White 103). Legg countered that he had every right to use the female pseudonym because it was the property of the corporation (White 104). Sometimes the use of pseudonyms was a way in which the editorial staff of *ONE* could appear to be larger and more continuous than they really were, giving *ONE* the appearance of stability. For example, Armando Quezon was listed as the International editor for years though he never existed in reality. Additionally, Jim Kepner published his Tangents column under the name Dal McIntire for years. After he resigned, the editors continued to publish the column under the name Del McIntire, explaining to readers that Del was Dal's brother who had taken over because Dal was exhausted from going through newspaper clippings too numerous to count (January and June 1961 Tangents columns).

⁶ Two archives currently exist that contain the majority of the historical records of *ONE*, Inc. The Vern and Bonnie Bullough collection through California State University contains the documents passed on from the Homosexual Information Center which was the organization that Don Slater started after the 1965 split of *ONE*, Inc ("History"). It is unclear when these documents were made available to researchers but none of

instance, D'Emilio claims that ONE's circulation was 5,000 but that statistic is from its highest circulation year, not an average over their years of publication and cannot be considered fully accurate of their circulation. Streitmatter mistakenly claims that Norman Mailer submitted an original short story to *ONE* when he actually wrote a non-fiction essay (26).

Two scholars have written in-depth analysis of ONE in recent years. C. Todd White wrote a comprehensive review of ONE's history through the use of the records of the Homosexual Information Center, titled *Pre-Gay L.A.* John Dennett Master II wrote his dissertation, "*A Part of Our Liberation*": *ONE Magazine and the Cultivation of Gay Liberation, 1953-1963*, which was not meant to be a comprehensive history of *ONE* but an analysis of its content, using the records of ONE National Gay and Lesbian archives. It contains a great deal of historic information despite his goal to focus on the content of *ONE*. Outside of the primary sources, I consider both of these documents the most valuable source of accurate information concerning ONE that are currently available to academicians.

Though some of the facts may be in question from the earlier writings on the homophile period, these authors' analysis of the content of *ONE* is very useful. They identify themes and questions with which early gay and lesbian activists struggled, some of which are still important today. For instance, Dennis Altman discusses the question of what causes homosexuality, a question that appeared within the pages of *ONE*. Like his contemporaries in the 1970s, and many of the contributors to *ONE*, Altman believes that all people have a "bisexual potential" and develop either toward heterosexuality or

the early historians cite use of HIC. The other archive is now part of the USC Library system and contains the documents from Jim Kepner's International Gay & Lesbian archives and Dorr Legg's ONE Institute ("Finding Aid of the ONE, Inc. Records").

homosexuality, depending on social circumstances (Altman 115). Other contributors argued that people are born homosexual, and nothing can change that fact (Krell Jun. 1954 *ONE* 5-11; "Letter from Mr. M" Mar. 1959 *ONE* 29). Additionally, Master spends an entire chapter discussing the question that plagued homosexuals during this time period--whether or not certain types of "swishy"⁷ behavior should be acceptable or not. *ONE*'s contributors go back and forth either in defense or disgust of gender performance outside of societal norms ("Why Do They Persecute Us So?" Sep. 1958 *ONE* 21-22; "Swish or Swim" Jan. 1959 *ONE* 6-9). White, Streitmatter, and Kepner discuss the way women were treated in the pages of *ONE* and as members of the staff. D'Emilio, Master and White all spend a great deal of time discussing the question that most scholars agree split the Mattachine Foundation into opposing factions in 1953: Do homosexuals comprise a unique minority with their own culture? These same historians also note the way in which *ONE* pushed back against "authorities" like the police, government, church, medicine/psychiatry, and the mainstream press.

Still, even with the many pages that have been written about this pioneering magazine, notable holes are present. One of the themes that recurs time and again within *ONE*'s pages is the idea that same sex sexual behavior has existed throughout history. *ONE* reprinted articles from ancient sources on homosexuality and articles discussing heroes of the past who were undoubtedly same sex oriented in an effort to show both the homosexual and the general public that individuals who were sexually attracted to members of their own sex have existed everywhere and always. In addition, there was a great deal of uncertainty during this period about the homosexual's place in society. There were many questions such as the following: Should homosexuals be encouraged to

⁷ This term is defined in Chapter 2 and its significance is discussed in detail.

form long-lasting monogamous relationships, should they marry heterosexuals in order to blend in, or should their lifestyle be promoted as an answer to overpopulation? One more topic that comprised a significant proportion of *ONE*'s articles was the role of religion in the life of a homosexual. This discussion was more than just a push-back against the rejection that gay and lesbian men and women felt when it came to religious institutions, but also an attempt to reconcile the homosexual person to the religious climate of the United States in the 1950s. In an interview many years later, Kepner remembers, "This was an enormously conservative, conformist period, probably the most conformist period in our history" (qtd. in Marcus 47). Even though the pages of *ONE* are replete with these themes, they have not yet been thoroughly analyzed by homophile historians.

Though each of the topics mentioned above is important and deserves more study, such a project is too much to cover in one thesis. Therefore, I have chosen to focus on three topics that have largely been overlooked in the scholarly literature of this time period.⁸ After devoting the first chapter to a brief history of *ONE*, the next three chapters focus on neglected but important themes in *ONE*. Chapter 2 analyzes the way that the contributors to *ONE* discussed the role of religion in their lives and how concerns over organized religion may have pushed homosexuals toward dependence on one another with the feeling of a shared identity. Chapter 3 is a discussion of how the contributors to

⁸ It should be mentioned that push back against societal authorities, a topic discussed by many homophile scholars, and often considered *ONE*'s most important contribution to the homophile movement, is the most discussed conversation in the magazine. This category accounts for 284 of the articles I reviewed, which is 28.27% of *ONE*'s articles. 24.34% of the readers' letters also discussed this theme. Included in this category, though, are a plethora of sub-topics like denial of medical theory, rejection of psychiatry, advice on resisting police authority, awareness of postal authority's actions, responses to anti-homosexual information in the mainstream press, etc. Additionally, *ONE* printed a monthly column for news items that I included as part of this category. No other theme that I studied had a recurring column devoted to its specific topic. Still, this theme took up three times as much space as any other theme. It can be concluded that scholars who have studied *ONE* in the past successfully pinpointed the topic that its editors, contributors, and readers considered most important.

ONE attempted to answer the many questions homosexuals had concerning their place in society. This chapter illustrates how uncertain many homosexuals were about the idea of a shared identity: though the seeds are there, lack of unity is more evident. Chapter 4 considers the readers' responses to the information in *ONE* as elucidated in the "Letters" column. The reader's responses to the articles of *ONE* are extremely important because there are notable differences in the level of interest in the topics of religion and the homosexual's role in society. Additionally, the letters that *ONE* received from its readers are a key piece of evidence that at least some homosexuals were beginning to identify as members of a minority.

The Truth of *ONE*

From the vantage point of the late 20th and early 21st centuries, it is easier to determine what the editors of *ONE* actually believed about the topics above. At the time that the magazine was being published, however, it was difficult; the editors often wrote under multiple pseudonyms, not all of which matched the names of the editors on the masthead. Additionally, the editors printed many articles written by outside contributors and letters from their readers. The average recipient of *ONE* in the 1950s and 60s would only know that they were receiving a magazine filled with diverse opinions. D'Emilio criticizes the homophile magazines for printing the opinions of "individuals who harbored some of society's most negative attitudes toward homosexuality" (116). Though *ONE* very rarely did this, once in awhile they printed articles with information that would almost be considered hate speech today. Of course, then they also printed the responses from outraged readers. Master explains that the magazine might not have appeared to have a clear message because "homophiles and their readers were as uncertain of

homosexuality's place in American society as was the rest of the nation. They were equally uncertain about what it meant to *be* homosexual" (13-14). Master is most likely partially correct since some of the debates aired in *ONE* are still not settled today; however, I do not believe that is the entire reason their articles often contradicted each other. Streitmatter suggests that "ONE's editors deliberately sparked discord among readers by pursuing controversial subjects" (37). While it is true that they published essays on controversial topics, I also do not believe they did not do this to create "discord." There was a far more important reason for allowing many different topics to be written about in their magazine--they wanted a real discussion because they believed that such is the key to understanding their lives.

In April 1954, in the introduction to a new section for news items (which eventually became Jim Kepner's "Tangents" column), they explained, "ONE has an undying faith that TRUTH WILL OUT" ("Two, New Supplement" Apr. 1954 *ONE* 15). This was not just true for news articles they printed, but seems to be the credo by which they published. For example, when they received a scathing letter from a longtime friend of many of the editors, Betty Perdue (writing as Geraldine Jackson), criticizing the magazine for everything from its fiction to the news items it ran, they printed the full letter. They explained that "ONE's editors have always judged the value of the Magazine by the type of response it arouses. They have often given space to severe critics and even welcomed the acid attentions of Jeff Winters [Dale Jennings] and Donald Farrar" ("6 Reasons Why Your Little Magazine Won't Last" Jan. 1958 *ONE* 26). After receiving numerous letters in response to Perdue, they created a new section in March 1958 called "Readers on Writers" and printed both positive and negative responses they had received.

This was not an isolated incident but a perfect example of the editors' faith in the homosexual's ability to understand his or her own truth through the power of reasoned discourse. It is impossible to accurately analyze *ONE* magazine without understanding that the editors never strayed from the idea that "Truth Will Out." By focusing on under-examined themes in *ONE* and by looking at readers' as well as editors' writing, this thesis seeks to elucidate part the "truth" of *ONE*, as it was seen by the editor's, staff, contributors, and readers of the magazine.

CHAPTER I

ONE UPON A TIME: A BRIEF HISTORY OF *ONE* MAGAZINE⁹

ONE magazine was first conceived during a meeting of the Mattachine Foundation¹⁰ on October 15, 1952, by a group of men who were tired of just talking to each other about what it meant to be homosexual; they wanted to reach a larger audience (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 34; Streitmatter 18-19). Long-time *ONE* editor Don Slater later explained, “Before this time, homosexuals just spoke to themselves. They just talked--whispered, really--to each other” (qtd. in Streitmatter, 19). Similarly, Dale Jennings, the first editor of *ONE* said, “We were tired of locking the doors and pulling down the shades whenever we wanted to talk about who we were. So we just decided, ‘What the hell?’ and decided to take a different course of action” (qtd. in White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 18). In this spirit, a small group of men met often over the next two months in order to plan the magazine that they would soon begin to publish.

Many decisions about the magazine needed to be made. They needed a name, content, advice from an attorney, and a mission statement. They considered many names but when Bailey Whitaker proposed the name *ONE* (based on a quote from a Thomas Carlyle essay), it seemed to instantly resonate with the entire group (White *Pre-Gay L.A.*

⁹ C. Todd White's book, *Pre-Gay L.A.: A Social History of the Movement for Homosexual Rights*, contains the most in-depth history of *ONE* magazine and ONE, Inc. that is available and should be referenced for the much more detailed story. However, I have yet to find a brief, yet full account of their history. The intent of this section is to provide this type of history for the reader who might not have time to read White's book or the ability to piece together *ONE*'s history from various sources.

¹⁰ Like Meeker, I will refer to Mattachine as a Foundation until the split in leadership that occurred mid-1953. After that, it was commonly known as Mattachine Society (Meeker 38). I will discuss the split in depth later in this chapter.

33). The quote, which appeared in every issue they published, is "...a mystic bond of brotherhood makes all men one." Though their attorney originally advised them not to publish fiction because it could be easily misinterpreted, the editors soon realized that they would not be able to create a magazine that was long enough without it (Streitmatter 35). Due to the socially restrictive climate of the 1950s, they also agreed that every article should be submitted to an attorney for approval before it was published (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 35-36). The original statement of purpose upon which they ultimately decided was adopted December 16, 1952. It was created by combining paragraphs submitted by Dale Jennings, Bailey Whitaker, and Don Slater and would eventually determine the content of the magazine. The original statement of purpose is as follows:

ONE does not claim that homosexuals are better or worse than anyone else, that they are special in any but one sense. And in that one sense ONE claims positively that homosexuals do not have the civil rights assured all other citizens. ONE is devoted to correcting this.

ONE means to stimulate thought, criticism, research, literary and artistic production in an effort to bring the public to understand deviants and deviants to understand themselves as the two sides are brought together as one.

ONE advocates in no way any illegal acts, condones none in the past, incites none in the future. This magazine is not and does not wish to be merely an erotic publication.

ONE is frankly at odds with present unjust laws pertinent to deviation and with present authorities who abuse their offices in unjust treatment of deviants.

ONE is backed by no political or social group, leans toward none, is wholly and completely unfinanced. ONE has no paid employees yet and its growth is dependent entirely upon its readers. Your manuscripts, contributions and work are welcomed. ONE is entirely yours.

This statement appeared in most issues until March 1954. Without explanation, in July 1954, a shorter mission statement appeared in the magazine. It read:

A non-profit corporation formed to publish a magazine dealing primarily with homosexuality from the scientific, historical and critical point of view...books, magazines...pamphlets...to sponsor educational programs, lectures and concerts for the aid and benefit of social variants, and to promoted among the general public an interest, knowledge and understanding of the problems of variation...to sponsor research and promote the integration into society of such persons whose behavior and inclinations vary from current moral and social standards.

Not even White was able to uncover the reason that the statement changed when it did.

The first group of statements was a collaboration from ONE's founding members while the latter is actually from ONE's constitution. It is likely that changes in leadership during this time period led to the revision of the statement to more closely mirror that of the larger organization.

The small group that began *ONE* decided to start a “non-profit” corporation of the same name, most likely on the advice of their attorney, though White does not specifically say so (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 34).¹¹ This corporation would have a board of directors that would oversee the production of *ONE*. Their goals for the board of directors were originally very inclusive. They wanted to have nine members, three of whom would be women, one of whom should be African American, one of whom should be Asian, and one of whom should be of another race (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 34). Unfortunately, these goals were never fully achieved, but the goal itself shows that they did want to account for some of the diversity of the homosexual population in America.

According to their articles of incorporation, “The specific and primary purposes for which this corporation was formed were to publish and disseminate a magazine dealing primarily with homosexuality from the scientific, historical and critical point of

¹¹ The corporation’s long-standing business manager, Dorr Legg, never filed the paperwork for tax-exempt status and the corporation never actually existed as a tax-exempt organization even though *ONE* told its members that their contributions were tax deductible.

view, and to aid in the social integration and rehabilitation of the sexual variant” (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 42-43). By January 1956, ONE, Inc. had four specific divisions, though they were being developed from 1953 onward.¹² The divisions were Publications, Social Service, Research, and Education ("Report of the Midwinter Institute" Jan. 1956 *ONE* 4; "Who Would have Thought?" Oct. 1963 *ONE* 14-17).¹³ The Publications Division was in charge of *ONE* Magazine, book publishing (they published four books from 1954-1963), and the book service.¹⁴ The Social Service Division has been critiqued as being ineffective but they attempted to help homosexuals find jobs, attorneys, supportive psychiatrists, and even religious counseling etc. ("Report on Social Service" Feb. 1955 *ONE* 17; "Editorial" Jul. 1963 *ONE* 4). Reading between the lines of D’Emilio and White’s accounts of ONE, the Social Service Division received virtually no funding. However, in the early 1960s, this division led a successful gay European Tour, which was their most notable achievement. Likewise, the Research Division was never very successful or well-funded. I have been unable to discover anything significant in which this division of ONE was involved and even ONE's own description of it contains no specific details about projects in which they were involved ("Who Would have Thought?" Oct. 1963 *ONE* 17). The Education Division, led for all of its years by Dorr

¹² The transformation from ideas of what they should do to distinct divisions can be seen in the early years of the Magazine. Specifically, the February 1955 issue contained Reports from the Library and Social Services only, but by January 1956, the "Report of the Midwinter Institute" has dropped the term "library" for "publications" and the four divisions are clear.

¹³ White argues that the four divisions were Book Service (or Publications as he later calls it), Bureau of Public Information, Education and Social Services. However, according to *ONE* Magazine from January 1956 and October 1963, I have the correct divisions listed. White explains that the Bureau of Public Information was "a watchdog service that publicized news reports of 'illegal acts directed against homosexuals by public and private figures and to correct published falsehoods about homosexuals'" (79). My best educated guess is that as Jim Kepner's news column became more popular, it subsumed the responsibilities of this division and it was no longer needed as such.

¹⁴ The four titles published by ONE, Inc. during these years were: *Game of Fools*, *Homosexuals Today*, and *The Keval*, and *Crime Against Nature*. All were advertised in *ONE* Magazine. The book service was a list of publications on the topic of homosexuality, many of which were reviewed, sometimes negatively, in ONE’s recurring “Book” column; the titles were available for order through ONE, Inc.

Legg, created their own University, ONE Institute (non-accredited) for Homophile Studies, and their own scholarly publication, *ONE Institute Quarterly*.

Financing all of these activities was difficult. The magazine was never profitable, though that certainly was not the goal initially (Streitmatter 29). According to Don Slater, the editors often put their own money into keeping everything functioning. There were two main difficulties when it came to funding *ONE*: lack of advertising and low sales. Most traditional magazines use advertising to pay for their business expenses, but because *ONE* was a homosexual magazine they had a difficult time attracting advertisers (Gross 27; Streitmatter 29). Martin Block, long-time *ONE* editorial staff member, recalls: “We absolutely talked our heads off trying to persuade stores to advertise, but the owners adamantly refused. They insisted that their businesses would be destroyed if their customers saw they were advertising in a gay magazine. It was ridiculous. We gay men *were* those customers!” (qtd. in Streitmatter 29). Then, when *ONE* finally found a company willing to advertise because their products were targeted to gay men, there was an uproar from readers who were offended by the “disgusting” ads (“Letters to the Editors” Nov. 1954 *ONE* 25). Instead of relying on advertising dollars, *ONE* was funded by subscriptions, membership fees, and donations from supporters.¹⁵

Subscriptions and sales were also not easy to acquire. The magazine targeted a group of Americans who were often very isolated and secretive. At first, the staff members took their magazine from gay bar to gay bar in L.A. and San Francisco (Streitmatter 29). Early on, they also got a list of potential subscribers from Mattachine

¹⁵ There is no one place I can cite for this fact because it comes from reading *ONE* magazine’s articles, advertisements, and letters. Membership levels and fees are described in many issues, for an example see the February 1956 issue. A typical advertisement seeking donations can be found in the insert to the November 1960 issue. Typical letters in response to the request for donations can be found in the August 1955 “Letters to the Editors” column.

Foundation (Master 48-49). They also sent free copies to politicians, lawyers, mental health professionals, and well-known writers (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 40). Later, they relied on readers to send them names and addresses of people who might be interested in receiving a copy ("Note from Circulation Manager" Jan. 1956 *ONE* 30). Additionally, after a few successful issues, they were able to convince certain newsstands to sell copies and by 1960 they claimed to be selling copies at newsstands in every state (Streitmatter 29). Word of mouth was also very important, as it is to every business. *ONE* received numerous letters from men and women around the country who had heard of *ONE* through a friend.¹⁶ Many of these people shared issues with others instead of purchasing a subscription themselves, as was common practice. Even if they did not subscribe, they often sent a donation to help support *ONE* (D'Emilio 110). Considering they never had a stable source of funding, the eventual circulation of *ONE* was remarkable.

To understand the history of *ONE*, each of the three time periods mentioned in the introduction deserve a more thorough explanation. In the initial period, Dale Jennings was the most dominant personality in leadership of *ONE* (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 52-58). He served as the editor of *ONE*, from August 1953 to February 1954 and was one of the founders of the Mattachine Foundation (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 16-23; "Editorial" Jun. 62 *ONE* 4). He was also extremely well-known in homosexual circles in Southern California in the 1950s for being the defendant in a highly publicized trial in which he admitted publicly that he was homosexual, but plead not guilty to homosexual actions. The Mattachine Foundation used his situation as a test case to determine if the courts were ready to support homosexuals in their fight against police entrapment. They supported

¹⁶ For an example see "Letter from Mr. B" in Jun. 1956 *ONE* 29.

Jennings financially through an independent fund.¹⁷ His name on the masthead of *ONE* magazine, no doubt, helped it become successful during that first year of publication. However, it is possible that Jennings let the celebrity lead to an overtly conceited nature; White cites evidence that some other staff members resigned complaining of his "tyrannical hold over the magazine." White details an arrogant speech Jennings gave at a Mattachine Society event in which he was being honored, and discusses the combative articles Jennings wrote in *ONE* (52-54). White's analysis of ONE's institutional records is supported by the memory of Jim Kepner, who later explained that Jennings wrote almost the whole December 1953 issue alone and other staff members did not appreciate it (Kepner *Rough News* 5). Though his resignation was not made official until March 22, 1954, the last article he wrote for *ONE* was a negative attack on the Mattachine which appeared in the January 1954 issue.

The second and most stable period of *ONE*'s history is the focus of this thesis; as such, I will explain what was happening with ONE, Inc. during this time period beyond the publication of *ONE* magazine. First, ONE had problems with government officials. Some of the difficulties began during the first period of ONE's history but they came to a head later. In July of 1953, the FBI began a formal investigation of *ONE*; they believed it would be obscene and might contain communist sentiments (Streitmatter 31). Every issue was sent to FBI headquarters and they worked with local police to do background checks on all of the editors (the editors, though they often wrote under pseudonyms, opted to use their real names on the magazine's masthead) (Streitmatter 31). The FBI sent letters to all of their employers and, though no copies survive, it was not uncommon to refer to a homosexual as a "pervert," "security risk," or "deviant" (Streitmatter 32). When Martin

¹⁷ D'Emilio 70-71 and White 23-27 go into depth about the trial in their books.

Block and Dorr Legg, two of those editors, were interviewed years later, they explained that though none of the eight editors who were investigated lost their jobs (which was unusual in the time period), the letters probably did a great deal of damage to their careers, costing them advancement opportunities (Streitmatter 32). Then, after *ONE* published an article in late 1955 claiming that homosexuals worked in the FBI, J. Edgar Hoover (then director of the Bureau and a suspected homosexual), gave his approval to intensify the investigation, leading to FBI interviews and intimidation tactics in the offices of *ONE*, Inc. (Streitmatter 32-33).¹⁸

ONE also fought a lengthy battle with the U.S. Post Office that ended with a U.S. Supreme Court case. The California Post Office seized the August 1953 issue on grounds of obscenity, but it was later released due to a decision by the D.C. Post Office (Gross 28). *ONE* took a militant stand after this encounter and in a brash article in the October 1953 issue they exclaimed, “*ONE* is Not Grateful”; splashing this statement all over the front and back covers of the issue (“*ONE* and the U.S. Post Office” Mar. 1957 *ONE* 5). The article explained that *ONE* is not obscene and the August issue should never have been held in the first place. They “thank no one for this reluctant acceptance” (reprinted in “*ONE* and the U.S. Post Office” Mar. 1957 *ONE* 5). Though the editors deserve credit for their courage in this encounter, the aggressive article did not win them any favor with postal authorities. Additionally, the Post Office was under pressure from a Wisconsin Senator, Alexander Wiley, who wrote them to ask why they were allowing materials “devoted to the advancement of sexual perversion” to be sent through the mail (Gross 28). Then in October 1954, the Post Office once again refused to mail *ONE*, claiming that

¹⁸ Streitmatter is not the only historian who wrote about *ONE*’s encounters with the FBI; however, he is the most thorough and his analysis is primarily based on the FBI case files, which have been made available to the public, so I chose to focus on his account.

two of the fiction pieces were “obscene, lewd, lascivious, and filthy” (D’Emilio 115). ONE made the decision to undertake the lengthy process of suing the postal authorities. In 1956, they lost their case in federal district court, then again in federal appeals court (D’Emilio 115; Streitmatter 35). Despite the financial costs, ONE, Inc. opted to appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court because the continuation of publication of *ONE* depended upon a favorable decision. In January 1958, the Supreme Court, without even issuing a written decision, ruled in favor of ONE (Streitmatter 35). Most scholars of the homophile movement believe that this was a turning point for the gay press (D’Emilio 115; Streitmatter 35; Meeker 137). The highest court in the land had declared that discussion of homosexuality is not, in itself, obscene. Additionally, the win seemed to spur the FBI to rethink their investigation and they soon stopped sending copies of *ONE* to their headquarters in D.C. (Streitmatter 36).

Through all of the difficulties, ONE continued to grow and develop a program of activities to help homosexuals develop greater understanding of themselves. ONE held their first Midwinter Institute in January 1954. The Midwinter Institute was a public event in which guests listened to speakers, participated in roundtable discussions, and sometimes social events ("Advertisement of Midwinter Institute" Jan. 1955 *ONE* 44; White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 73). According to White, the Midwinter Institute was held every year for twenty-five years, long after the magazine stopped being published in 1969 (73). The January 1955 Midwinter Institute was the first large public gathering of homosexuals in the United States (Meeker 32).

Additionally, ONE published books on the topic of homosexuality and also sold other books written on the theme ("Who Would Have Thought?" Oct. 1963 *ONE* 17).

They also kept a library in their offices of books that were donated and available to students of ONE Institute, members, and "qualified research workers" ("Note of thanks to David Cohan for book donations" Apr. 1957 *ONE* 23; White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 78; "Who Would Have Thought" Oct. 1963 *ONE* 17). As they became internationally known, ONE had visitors to their offices from all over the United States and countries as far away as New Zealand; Alfred Kinsey even stopped in meet with the editors before his death in August 1956 ("Editorial" Aug. & Sep. 1956 *ONE* 6; White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 90).

Additionally, in 1956, ONE also began publishing a newsletter for members who paid dues, which was both an attempt to raise funds and a means through which they could print information that was not suitable for the general audience of *ONE* magazine, such as corporate minutes or details of ONE's court case against the U.S. Post Office ("Advertisement for ONE Confidential" Jan. 1956 *ONE* 5; White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 29; Master 99). The corporation established different levels for membership. For example, an annual member could pay \$10 and would receive *ONE* for a year, the first copy of *ONE Confidential*, and a ticket to the annual meeting; a sustaining member, on the other hand could pay \$5 a month and receive *ONE* for a year, *all* copies of *ONE Confidential*, and a ticket to the annual meeting ("Advertisement for Non-Voting Members" Feb. 1956 *ONE* 30). Membership was used to encourage and reward devoted supporters of the magazine.

The project that drained a majority of ONE's financial and energy resources during the second era was One Institute for Homophile Studies and its magazine, *ONE Institute Quarterly*. According to White, ONE Institute was conceived by members of the education division (Jim Kepner, Julian Underwood, and Dorr Legg) during the summer of 1956. They believed that there was a dearth of research and education on the topic of

homosexuality and intended to fill the gap by offering courses out of their offices in Los Angeles (74). They began offering classes in 1956 at the undergraduate and graduate level. Two examples of the classes they offered are "Homosexuals in American Society" and "Landmarks in Homophile Literature" ("Advertisement for ONE Institute Classes" Oct. 1959 *ONE* 32). Eventually they even offered one-day extension courses in other cities ("Advertisement for ONE Institute Extension Classes in Denver" Aug. 1959 *ONE* 32). Professors were never paid, enrollment was not high and classes were often canceled, but Legg and Kepner believed that the Institute was ONE's "most urgent mission" (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 74, 87-88). In an interview years later, Legg said that his goal was "building the finest library and education institution for homophile studies the world would ever know" (qtd. in Cain 6).

ONE Institute Quarterly was a scholarly journal for the faculty and students of ONE Institute. *ONE* magazine published two reviews of *Quarterly* that were written by a French writer for *Arcadie* (the French monthly homosexual magazine). In his first review, he chastised the magazine for being unscholarly and lacking good methodology ("A Frenchman Reviews Homophile Studies" Feb. 1959 *ONE* 23-24). In the second review, written just over a year later, the author thought *Quarterly* had gotten better and praised *ONE* for printing the negative review from the year before. Overall, however, his review of the articles published in *ONE Institute Quarterly* were fairly negative ("One Institute Quarterly: Homophile Studies" May 1960 *ONE* 5-11). Due to a lack of scholarship or in-depth analysis of this magazine, it is difficult to say whether it was a positive addition to the homophile movement. What is clear is that Dorr Legg believed that it was and continued to publish it even though it was a constant drain on ONE's resources (White

Pre-Gay L.A. 87).

Not only were ONE Institute and *Quarterly* a financial drain, but Legg's insistence on their prominence over the magazine caused the tension between Legg and Slater, leading to the third period of the *ONE* magazine's history.¹⁹ According to their articles of incorporation, the primary purpose of ONE, Inc. was to produce a magazine (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 42-43). Slater believed that the corporation would not exist without the magazine (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 59). However, as Legg seemed to see it, the magazine was just the beginning of the much larger endeavor of educating the world about homosexuality (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 60). As leader of the corporation, Legg shifted more and more of ONE's resources away from the magazine over the years and maintained that the corporation had the right to control the direction of its activities (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 111). Thus, the editors of the magazine had no real authority when it came to ONE, Inc. (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 60). Legg's control over ONE began when Jennings resigned in 1954 and, according to Kepner, lasted for forty-one years (Kepner 3; White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 61).²⁰ Legg had a vision for the homophile movement, but he was also "haughty," "imperious" and stubborn (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 124). Over the years, numerous talented editors and board members resigned after becoming frustrated with Legg's conduct; talented men and women like Jim Kepner, Corky Wolf, Stella Rush, Joan Corbin, and eventually Don Slater left the magazine (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 124; Kepner 395). There is

¹⁹ It is important to note that I am using White's account of the problems between Legg and Slater because, in writing his dissertation that became his book, he worked very closely with Tangents Group, which was the group Slater started after separating from ONE. He is extremely critical of Legg, and even Slater to a point. However, his research and writing are well after Legg and Slater reconciled a few years before their deaths in the 1990s. Additionally, he uses institutional records and not just personal recollections to piece together these events so it is my belief that his analysis is not skewed as a result of being affiliated with Tangent Group. Legg deserves criticism for his handling of *ONE*. By his own admission, he didn't care about the magazine at all (Cain 6).

²⁰ ONE Inc. existed as an organization until Dorr Legg's death in 1994. At that point it merged with the International Gay and Lesbian Archives ("Finding Aid of ONE Incorporated Records").

no doubt that Legg deserves credit for devoting himself so completely to ONE; however, White notes that his leadership also led directly to the schism of ONE that occurred in 1965 (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 122-136).

In 1965, Legg and his supporters on the board assigned a liaison between the editors and the board of directors (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 130). The editors were insulted and frustrated by this attempt by the board to assert dominance over editorial decisions and they refused to work with the liaison (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 130-131). Tensions were already high because it was clear that Legg did not care for the magazine and Slater, who had devoted considerable effort to it (as had most of the other editors), believed it was the most important vehicle for gaining the support of the homosexual population when working for change. In fact, Slater wanted to use it as a means to become even more active in pursuing legal change, possibly through lawsuits (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 85). Both Legg and Slater had supporters on the board in 1964. During the 1964 annual meeting, however, Legg bypassed ONE's long-standing voting procedures in an attempt to create a board of directors amenable to his policies (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 122-124). The meeting had turned into a huge fight, and possible new board members (including Harry Hay, founder of the Mattachine Foundation) left in disgust (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 122-123). After extending the meeting and nominating other possible board members, Legg was successful in gaining a majority support from the board, but Slater and his supporters thought that Legg may have manipulated the vote (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 123-124). The situation had been tense for over a year when it came to a head in April 1965 after Legg stormed into an editorial meeting and began screaming at the editors for refusing to work with their appointed liaison (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 131). Of the four editors present, two

walked out in the middle of the attack, the third resigned the next day, and Slater decided he was done working for Legg (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 131-134).

The end for the *ONE* magazine readers knew and loved had come. After consulting with his attorney, Slater and a few others rented new office space and took everything (books, chairs, desks, equipment, etc.) from *ONE*'s offices to the new space (Kepner 395; White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 134-135). Legg was, of course, incensed, but refused to come to any compromise with Slater (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 135). The two groups stayed separate, each continuing to publish the magazine under the name *ONE* until August 1965. This was obviously very confusing to readers who received both copies ("Finding aid of the *ONE* Incorporated records" 7). The two groups spent the next five years battling each other in court (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 135). However, in 1967 Legg's group won the right to retain the name *ONE*, even though the courts ruled that both groups were "legitimate halves" of what was once *ONE* magazine (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 137-138). Strangely, though, *ONE* stopped publishing *ONE* magazine that same year (Finding aid of the *ONE* Incorporated records" 7). It was revived briefly in 1972 but only lasted three issues (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 198-199). Slater's group published *Tangents* from 1965-1973 (Tangent Group-"Tangents Magazine").

***ONE*'s Connection to Mattachine**

The story of *ONE* cannot properly be told without some discussion of the connection between *ONE* and the Mattachine Society. Historians have not come to a consensus on just how connected these two groups were. Writing in early 1980s, D'Emilio argues that *ONE* was the "most significant development" to come out of the

Mattachine discussion groups. Published a year later, Michael Bronski's book, *Culture Clash: The Making of Gay Sensibility*, erroneously writes that *ONE* was a Mattachine publication. On the other end of the spectrum, Master asserts that the founders' of *ONE* did not want to appear to be connected to Mattachine; even if Mattachine inspired some of the founders, they were very different organizations, with different goals and priorities (Master 46-47). Later in the dissertation, Master does concede that *ONE*'s content had a similar spirit to that of Mattachine's original founders (Master 109). My belief is closest to what D'Emilio describes. If Mattachine Foundation²¹ was a sitcom, *ONE* was the "spinoff." The original idea was birthed at a Mattachine meeting; though formally a separate entity, it had the same characters and the same plot.

The Mattachine Foundation formally adopted its mission and purposes in July 1951. Their stated goals were to unite homosexuals, often isolated, into a "highly ethical homosexual culture," educate the homosexual and the general public regarding homosexuality, and provide leadership in the struggle for emancipation (D'Emilio 67-69; *White Pre-Gay L.A.* 18).²² All of this was premised upon the idea that homosexuals are a "separate people," much like other racial or ethnic minority groups (Meeker 38). While the Mattachine discussion groups were the primary means through which the Mattachine Foundation attempted to fulfill its mission, *ONE* used a publication. However, D'Emilio argues that both groups "encouraged self-examination and criticism" (89). The mission *ONE* printed in their magazine from July 1954 forward contains similar ideas, though in a milder form. The mission states that they want to educate the "social variant" and the "general public." When they write that they will "publish a magazine...from the

²¹ Note again that I am referring to Mattachine Foundation which was known as while the founders were leading the organization, from its beginnings in 1950 until new leadership took over in 1953.

²² The quote above is from the 1951 Mattachine "Missions and Purposes" document quoted in D'Emilio 69.

scientific, historical and critical point of view” it is unclear just how much of the published material would be a criticism of the current laws and authoritative statements regarding homosexuality, but upon an in-depth review of the magazine it is clear that this type of criticism was a significant portion of the text *ONE* printed and it did provide leadership in the homosexuals’ struggle for freedom.²³

The most controversial difference between the original Mattachine mission and the mission of *ONE* can be understood through a discussion of the last sentence in *ONE*'s mission statement. It states that *ONE* will “promote the integration into society of such persons whose behavior and inclinations vary from current moral and social standards.” Harry Hay, founder of Mattachine Foundation, believed that homosexuals were a minority group that had developed differently than the majority culture because the dominant society had not allowed them to take pride in their whole personhood (D’Emilio 77). For this reason they had developed their own homosexual culture. This appears to be the opposite of the “integration into society” that *ONE* includes in their mission statement. However, it is my belief that these statements are not as contradictory as they seem. Hay’s belief in a minority culture did not mean that he was a separatist. In fact, in the 1951 “Mattachine Missions and Purposes” it is stated that the society wanted to help homosexuals “lead well-adjusted, wholesome, and socially productive lives” (qtd. in D’Emilio 69). Unlike White who thinks that the final sentence in *ONE*’s mission is in opposition to the homosexual’s “right to be different,” I do not believe *ONE*’s mission authors took a side in that debate with their mission statement (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 43). Minority cultures have always existed in the United States, developing along their own

²³ 28.37% of the articles I reviewed addressed the homosexual's relationship to societal authorities. See Appendix B for further details.

lines, seeking their own place *within* the dominant culture. Further evidence that ONE's mission does not take a stance on this issue are the articles they printed over the years which contained both sides of the debate; many urged society to accept homosexuals the way they were, and many others urged homosexuals to try harder to blend in.

The debate over whether or not homosexuals are, and have the right to be, different was no small issue in the homophile movement. In fact, it was a big part of the reason that leadership in the Mattachine Foundation changed in 1953. The other primary reason was the communist affiliations of many of the Mattachine founders. During the McCarthy era, it was problematic to have any sort of affiliation with communism and when a mainstream media magazine article was printed that made this connection, members became nervous. The leadership, always secretive in the past, decided it was time to be more open so they called a convention (D'Emilio 75-81; Meeker 39). After many tense meetings, the founders decided that their past affiliation with the Communist Party might be a liability for Mattachine, and they were unhappy with the constitution that was being drafted, so they stepped down as a group (Adam 69; Rowland 35). The new leadership had fundamentally different beliefs regarding the homosexual minority. They believed that homosexuals were no different than anyone else except for private behavior and that the best way to win the acceptance of society was to behave according to social norms (Adam 69; D'Emilio 81). By November of 1953, the new leadership had even removed the word "homosexual" from the Mattachine constitution and the phrase "highly ethical homosexual culture" (D'Emilio 85). The new Mattachine Society and ONE had very little in common.

Still, the two organizations maintained a fairly harmonious relationship over the

years. That is, after Dale Jennings left the staff of *ONE*. If an unknowing reader were to pick up the copies of *ONE* from mid-1953 and January 1954, the relationship might appear extremely hostile. Jennings, a founder of Mattachine who stepped down from leadership during the 1953 convention, was unhappy with the direction in which the organization was moving. In 1953 he wrote (under the pseudonym “Jeff Winters”) an article that called the new Mattachine leaders “cowards with no mission or purpose” (White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 54). Then, in January 1954, he wrote another article chiding the Mattachine leaders for removing the word “homosexual” and the phrase “highly ethical homosexual culture” from their constitution (“Can Homosexuals Organize?” Jan. 1954 *ONE* 4-8). Readers complained about the negative attacks on a fellow organization working to benefit homosexuals and that may have been part of the reason that *ONE* stopped printing such negative features about Mattachine.²⁴ More likely though, the attacks stopped because a bitter, ex-leader of Mattachine resigned as editor of *ONE*. After Jennings left, *ONE* printed Mattachine news, they attended and presented at each others’ conventions, and *ONE* printed ads for the Mattachine Review (“Two Current News” May 1954 *ONE* 26; “Report of the Midwinter Institute” Jan. 1956 *ONE* 4; “Advertisement for the new Mattachine Publication” Jun. 1954 *ONE* 2). The editors of *ONE* were careful to explain that they printed advertisements for the Mattachine Review as a service to their readers, but did not necessarily fully support the policies of Mattachine (“Editor’s Reply” Feb. 59 *ONE* 27). Still, Dorr Legg, (using the pseudonym Marvin Cutler), credits The Mattachine Society and Foundation for laying “the groundwork for other organizations and publications in America” (Cutler 31). Indeed, without the existence of the Mattachine

²⁴ For an example of one such letter from a reader see the letter from University Station in the May 1954 issue. The editor’s reply that it seems to be the prevailing opinion among their readers that they stop printing their disagreements with Mattachine in *ONE*.

Foundation, it is highly unlikely that *ONE* would ever have existed.

Both Mattachine Foundation and the leaders of *ONE* magazine believed in the value of conversation. Whereas Mattachine sponsored small discussion groups, *ONE* created a conversation in which homosexuals all over the country and across the world could become involved. The next three chapters will show how *ONE*'s staff writers, contributors and readers used the forum of *ONE* magazine to explore topics they considered important to their lives. In fact, many of the conversations that began on the pages of *ONE* magazine are still discussed in the modern gay rights movement. Thus, although *ONE* was related to the original Mattachine in important ways, it made its own contribution to the homophile movement.

CHAPTER 2

RELIGION IN *ONE*

In his 1960 editorial for *ONE*'s religion issue, Jim Kepner (writing as Lyn Pedersen), discussed a conflict that he explains was of great importance to many homophiles. Homosexuals with a "strong religious impulse" were often denied membership and/or full acceptance in places of worship ("Editorial" Dec. 60 *ONE* 4). According to Kepner, this rejection usually resulted in the homophile making a choice either to discard religion entirely or remain in the church while keeping his or her true predilections a secret. The latter choice often involved living with fear and shame, the homophile often having internalized the idea that any expression of their love for another individual of their own sex is sinful. Kepner explains that most of the men and women who were in contact with *ONE*, Inc. were "convinced that they do need religion, and specifically acceptance by the Church of their choice" ("Editorial" Dec. 60 *ONE* 4).

ONE printed 65 articles addressing this topic between January 1954 and December 1963, 6.55% of the articles I reviewed. Some contained affirmations of faith or stories of homosexuals who had found peace in their churches ("Open Letter to the Honourable Davie Fulton" Dec. 60 *ONE* 8; "A Gay and Merry Christmas to You All" Dec. 57 6-9). Other times, they were a justification for turning away from religion, reporting about a book or minister with hateful ideas about homosexuality, or stories of men and women who felt a great deal of pain over their separation from their church ("God and a Homosexual" Jun. 54 *ONE* 5-11; "Sebo Griffum Prevails", May 54 *ONE* 24-

25; "Books" Aug. 60 *ONE* 19-20; "The Lonely Season," Dec. 57 *ONE* 10-13). *ONE* also contained reports of religion being discussed at their Midwinter Institutes and the addition of a religious counseling component to their Social Service Division ("Homosexuality: A Way of Life" Mar. 58 *ONE* 5-11; "Mental Health and Homosexuality" Jul. 58 *ONE* 15-16; "The Path of Truth" Jul. 63, *ONE* 5-9). It is clear that this was indeed a topic of great importance to the readers of *ONE*, yet no other historians of this time period have discussed it in their written works. White comes the closest when he mentions that *ONE* did a full issue on religion. However, because the topic was so important to *ONE*'s editors, contributors, and readers, it deserves much more attention.

This chapter focuses on the articles that were published in *ONE* magazine having to do with religion or morality. Some of these articles contained reports of official statements made by various authoritative bodies on the subject of religion and morality. The articles elucidated the editors' responses to these statements. Additionally, articles from *ONE*'s editors and contributors discussed their responses to facing rejection in their places of worship and the attempt to reconcile homosexuality with passages of the Bible that seem to condemn it. A few of the articles were written by contributors who had decided that organized religions had failed the homosexual and had nothing to offer them; these articles often offered alternate theories of morality and spirituality. This chapter also contains an analysis of the book reviews, a high percentage of which were critiques of books on religious topics.

***ONE* Reports Official Statements from Authorities**

The Committee on Homosexual Offenses and Prostitution in Great Britain published a report in 1957, which came to be known as the Wolfenden Report (after the chair of the Committee). The report concluded that there is a difference between criminal acts and immoral acts. Criminal acts are violations against the state and hurt the public. Immoral acts are a private matter. The Committee recommended removing statutes against private consensual homosexual acts from law (“Books”, Jun. 58 *ONE* 24-27). In the early 1950s, the Church of England conducted its own study on homosexuality. This study made a distinction between homosexuality and homosexual acts. According to the study, one cannot necessarily help having certain desires so those tendencies are neither right nor wrong. However, homosexual *acts* are sinful because they are not for procreative purposes (“A Bold Study – By the Church of England”, Jun. 54 *ONE* 17-18). The Church of England also recommended that the laws be changed because the government should not be allowed to regulate morality. Moreover, the laws make homosexuals more susceptible to blackmail and the punishments are not only too harsh, but they almost never serve to rehabilitate the homosexual (“Church of England Recommendations on Homosexuality” Jun. & Jul. 56 *ONE* 8-11). Additionally, *ONE* reported in 1957 that the Roman Catholic Church favored revising existing laws because sin is a private matter while crime is an “offense against the state;” consensual, adult homosexual sex acts are in the former category (“New Reports from London” Feb. 57 *ONE* 38).

Although these were the only official statements reported in *ONE*, it is clear from

the other articles that the teachings of Christianity were considered problematic to *ONE*'s staff, contributors, and readers. One reader explains:

I am a Jew but I gave up my religion long ago, for many reasons. I approached priests, rabbis and ministers on the question of homosexuality...The rabbis I questioned pointed out that in the Old Testament we were condemned to death. The Catholic priests said that homosexuality is a sin because it is a sexual emotion outside the holy state of marriage, stated by God to be between male and female for the purpose of bearing children. The Protestant ministers varied in their attitudes, but only quantitatively, not qualitatively. They all said homosexuality is a sin and a sickness, but they disagreed as to how much of which, all the way from God's condemning us to hell, to 'the homosexual is a sick person whose sickness is not his own fault' ("Letter from Mr. S" Dec. 60 *ONE* 29-30).

This reader includes Judaism in his critique, but the majority of articles on the topic of religion in *ONE* were regarding Christianity. Therefore, when I refer to “the Church” in this chapter, I am referring to all of the three major branches of Christianity (Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, and Protestant) that rely heavily on the Bible to support their anti-homosexual religious ideology.

***ONE*'s Response to Official Statements**

The writers for *ONE* did not wholly agree with the moral stance taken by the groups mentioned above. In a December 1957 editorial, Don Slater wrote that *ONE* supports the Wolfenden Report's conclusion that homosexual acts should not be illegal, but denies the charge that these acts are immoral (“Editorial”, Dec. 57 *ONE* 4). As is stated above, the primary charge of immorality was contingent upon the fact that homosexual acts are non-procreative. *ONE* argued that such a foundation is patently absurd and incongruent with the reality of people's lives. Were men and women to have sex only for procreation, it would happen much less frequently than most couples

probably desire (“The Doctor and the Homosexual” Feb. 56 *ONE* 4-5). Kepner (writing as Pedersen) argues that there are numerous examples of wasted “seed” in nature and that most species have individuals who engage in sex acts but never procreate (“The Doctor and the Homosexual” Feb. 56 *ONE* 4-5; “It Just Isn’t Natural” Aug. & Sep. 57 *ONE* 8-12). To him, love is just as good a reason as procreation to engage in sexual activity (“Editorial” Dec. 60 *ONE* 4-5).

Another justification given for a belief in the immorality of homosexuality was that it is not natural. Kepner uses Kinsey’s theory that “natural” should be determined by what happens in nature. Those who study nature should be the ones who determine what is natural or unnatural, and those scientists have noticed that in other species homosexuality is not unusual. Kepner cites numerous species in which same sex sexual activities have been observed (“It Just Isn’t Natural” Aug. & Sep. 57 *ONE* 8-12).

ONE's Response to Christian Ideology

ONE's readers and editors felt unfairly targeted by Christian ideology. The implicit idea in the “sex for procreation only” argument was that if an individual is to remain righteous, he or she must abstain from all sexual activity. *Heterosexuals* were not denied church membership when they engaged in non-procreative sex. In fact, a Catholic priest who wrote an article for *ONE* pointed out that heterosexuals often engaged in a host of other unsanctioned activities such as adultery, contraceptive use, masturbation, etc. These men and women were not denied acceptance in the Church for activities that were arguably just as sinful as homosexual acts. The priest writing this article went so far as to argue that focusing on homosexual sin has been the Church’s method of avoiding

addressing heterosexual sinfulness (“The Church and the Homosexual” Dec. 60 21-23).

Writers and readers were grateful that the some Christian churches had taken a step toward accepting that homosexuals can love each other deeply with an understanding that such love is not immoral. However, without the support for homosexuals to fulfill their love through sexual activity as heterosexuals were allowed, it seemed a shallow victory (“Editorial”, Dec. 60 *ONE* 4-5). A writer for *ONE* described the problematic situation between the church and the homosexual this way: “But it does seem to me most frightfully wrong for a man to think he must have no sexual life just because he is homosexual. I have known young men to go downhill and become morally useless simply because they are highly sexed and homosexual, and yet regard their desires as sinful. This is torture” (“Christian Faith and Sexual Relationships” Apr. 60 *ONE* 23). An attempt to reconcile same sex sexuality with the teaching of Christianity had to be made before this situation could be rectified.

One means through which reconciliation between homosexuals and the church was attempted was interpreting the Bible in ways not commonly accepted by mainstream churches. The Old Testament contained stories that were used to discredit homosexuals, but it also contained stories that homosexuals used to justify their choices. The story of Sodom and Gomorrah, from which the sin of sodomy was named, has traditionally been told as the story of cities destroyed because of the same sex sexual actions of their residents. However, Julian Underwood (writing as R.H. Crowther) argues that the actions of the men of Sodom and Gomorrah were only sinful because they hurt others with their out of control sexual desires. Unlike those men, homosexuals, by in large, did not want to live base sexual lives but full, complete lives within a society that is moral (“Sodom-A

Homosexual Viewpoint” Jan. 55 *ONE* 24-27). Additionally, the love between David and Jonathan was also upheld as an example of homosexual love because they loved each other more than they loved any woman (“Rahab, the Harlot of Jericho” Dec. 60 *ONE* 6-7; “Guilt and the Homosexual” Dec. 60 *ONE* 12-13).

Writers of *ONE* also attempted to address New Testament-based doctrine. The words of Paul were often used in anti-homosexual debates to condemn same sex sexual behavior (“The Society for Human Rights” Sep. 62 *ONE* 5-11; (“St. Paul on Sodomy” Apr. 58 *ONE* 23-24). This idea was attacked by numerous writers, including three members of the Catholic clergy who submitted articles to *ONE*. The ministers wrote articles explaining that Paul either misinterpreted Christ’s teachings or was writing for a particular social situation (“The Church and the Homosexual” Dec. 60 *ONE* 21-23; “Guilt and the Homosexual” Dec. 60 *ONE* 12-13). Another writer²⁵ analyzed a particular verse from 1 Corinthians and showed how it seemed contradictory to the idea of a God who loves the men and women he created to be a certain way (“St. Paul on Sodomy” Apr. 58 *ONE* 23-24). Kepner accused Paul of repressed homosexuality (“Thorn in the Spirit” Jun. 54 *ONE* 21-24). The basis of each of these reinterpretations of the writings of Paul, whether espoused by a member of the clergy or a Catholic/Protestant thinker, was how far from the teachings of Jesus Christ they seemed. Two of the priests, Reverend Martin and Father Newman, argued that Christ never condemned the homosexual and he healed the “servant” of the Roman centurion who, from historical evidence, was most likely the centurion’s lover (“Guilt and the Homosexual” Dec. 60 *ONE* 12-13). Without shame, Jesus ate with, healed, forgave, and loved people who were considered “sinners”

²⁵ This writer does not appear to be a minister, but there is evidence that he is Protestant because he explains that he is not a "member of the fundamentalist school of Biblical thought."

by their own society's standards ("Rahab, the Harlot of Jericho" Dec. 60 *ONE* 6-7). Gerald Heard (a well-known English scholar and author wrote several articles for *ONE* under the pseudonym D.B. Vest) passionately argued that religion is supposed to be about love—they all start as religions of love but then get corrupted ("What is Religion?" Jun. 54 *ONE* 12-13).²⁶ The writers for *ONE* wanted to return Christianity to its roots of love. They believed that Christ's actions were the example to follow and that Paul's words should not be allowed to take precedence. Some of the writers argued that no sex act can be immoral if it is done out of love, just like even heterosexual acts *can* be immoral if they are "for selfish ends" ("Christian Faith and Sexual Relationships" Apr. 60 *ONE* 21-23; "As For Me" Feb. 63 *ONE* 16-20).

***ONE's* Fighting Words**

Sometimes, the authors of articles in *ONE* used "scare tactics" to provoke deeper understanding of the homophile situation. Kepner (writing as Pedersen) argued that if homosexuals were to leave the churches en masse, the charitable works of the Church would be largely unsupported because the homophiles not only do a great deal of the work, but give a large portion of the funds for charitable work ("Editorial" Dec. 60 *ONE* 4-5). James F. Kearful goes over the long list of discriminatory police practices under which homosexuals suffered during this time period, especially in larger cities, and compares them to the persecution of the Jews in Nazi Germany. His point was that the Church did nothing to stand up against the oppression in Germany until it was too late and that is what he saw happening in early 1960s America ("The New Nazism" May 63

²⁶ The crux of Heard's argument is that all religions begin as religions of love. He is not addressing any specific faith tradition, nor is necessarily only addressing Christianity, but religion in general.

ONE 5-11).

Echoing the idea that Christian churches have a responsibility to behave in a Christ-like fashion, supporting and even loving those whom society unfairly targets, Dorr Legg writes, “For if religion is unable to produce men who are humane and decent, then the moral codes of the churches are ineffective. ‘By their fruits ye know them.’ The old excuse that one should not judge Christianity by Christians no longer seems persuasive in a pragmatic age such as our own” (“A Moral Imperative” Dec. 63 *ONE* 11). Legg actually lists the numerous churches *ONE* tried to reach out to for support over the years, which resulted in only two Eastern Orthodox priests volunteering to work with them. Legg explains that *ONE* met with thousands of individuals in their offices each year, many of whom had been denied membership in the churches of their choice if they did not pretend to be heterosexual (“A Moral Imperative” Dec. 63 *ONE* 6-11). Legg claims that the churches failed homosexuals. He concludes, “The churches will continue to lose the respect and the allegiance of those homosexual men and women who refuse to settle for the ethical standard that has two faces. Either religion makes provision for the inborn goodness and dignity of man—all men—or religion is found wanting” (“A Moral Imperative” Dec. 63 *ONE* 11).

***ONE*’s Writers Who Found Organized Religion Wanting**

Not every writer for *ONE* saw a need to be reconciled to the teachings of the Christian churches. Arthur B. Krell (pseudonym, but it is unclear for whom),²⁷ explained that he was rejecting organized religion, not because he did not believe in God, but because the God in which he had faith created him with homosexual drives and any

²⁷ See Appendix A for a full list of pseudonyms.

religion that made him feel as though God made a mistake was not worth believing, in his opinion. In fact, he argues, accepting a religion that condemns homosexuality might actually lead a homosexual away from God. He writes, “A man’s love nature is his essence. And if some priest had ever shamed me into trying to cast that away, what shell of me would have been left, for seeking Whole Truth?” (“God and a Homosexual” Jun. 54 *ONE* 5-11). The author of a previously quoted article agreed. He writes:

...and if they cannot conscientiously remain within the church without thinking of themselves as evil, then the best thing they can do is to leave the church. No one can change his nature. But I should not myself be able to believe in a God who condemns people for being the way he has made them, or for expressing their love for another in the way which is natural to them (“Christian Faith and Sexual Relationships” Apr. 60 *ONE* 23).

James Barr (pseudonym for James Fugate), another well-known author, argued that religion has been extremely harmful to society and that there is no point in trying to be accepted by churches that will reject the homophile if ever his “sins” become known (“On Organized Religion” Jun. 54 *ONE* 19-20). Additionally, many writers wondered why homosexuals so often tried to pattern their lives after the heterosexual lifestyle. They denied the idea that all sex acts have to take place within a *monogamous relationship* or even within the confines of love, the former of which is a concept on which Christian churches were adamant (“Toward Understanding” Jun. 59 *ONE* 26-29; “Augmented Families” Feb. 60 *ONE* 6-9; “Is There An Alternative?” Feb. 60 *ONE* 18-19; “Homosexual Procreation” Mar. 61 *ONE* 6-8).²⁸

Still, turning away from organized religion did not mean that these writers had rejected all spirituality. Like Krell, many of the authors had a belief in a higher power.

²⁸ The ideas of these authors are discussed in further detail in Chapter 3, under the heading “How Does the Homosexual Fit Into Society?”

One author suggested that they start a “homophile monastery” for men who wanted to “pursue noble aims” but also take part in sexual interactions with persons of the same sex (“How About a Homophile Monastery?” Oct. 62 *ONE* 24-15). Another author (who was unpopular with many of the readers for some of her views) suggested that many of the world’s religions embrace celibacy as a means to reach the “Cosmic Consciousness” and that homosexuals might benefit from the practice. A frequent contributor to *ONE* and professor at ONE Institute, Dr. Merritt M. Thompson (writing as T.M. Merritt), believed that homosexuals needed to rely on each other for love and acceptance. There is a spiritual timbre to the following declaration: “But he is not alone. The brotherhood ‘which makes all men one’ is with him and in association with kindred spirits working for the same goals and ideas he may find a deeper satisfaction than he had hitherto known” (“Homosexuality and Scientific Humanism” Feb. 58 *ONE* 23-24).²⁹ All of these conversations show that many homosexuals of this time period had a deep desire to take part in some sort of spiritual life, even if it had to take place outside of religious institutions. Moreover, these articles most closely reflect what D’Emilio calls a “shared group identity” (2). Merritt’s use of the phrase “kindred spirits” is illustrative of the growing sense that homosexual men and women shared some sort of bond. The idea of the homophile monastery is similar in that it is the desire to bring homosexuals together, both in location and in spirit.

Not all of the contributors to *ONE* were necessarily concerned with spirituality though. The idea that science, not religion, should be the arbiter of truth for homosexuals was discussed by *ONE*’s staff and contributors. Julian Underwood (as Robert Gregory)

²⁹ The quote that Merritt uses is from the Thomas Carlyle poem from which *ONE* took its name. A portion of the of the poem “...a mystic bond of brotherhood makes all men one” appeared in every issue they printed.

wondered why no one ever asked what is normal about heterosexual relationships when science shows that all types of sexual variance exists in nature. He mockingly uses religious imagery to demand that scientists takes these facts into account in their work, though this was not always what happened, writing, “In vain one asks: From what tablets of stone, what Siniatic summit have been handed down to us these Commandments of Heterosexual Union? Are they indeed divinely ordained by the Very most High of Biology? Or are we finding ourselves formerly whip-lashed by organized Religion and today, instead, by organized Science?” (“Editorial” Dec. 55 *ONE* 4). Dr. Thompson supported Scientific Humanism, insisting that rationality and science have led mankind forward throughout history, not religious (“Homosexuality and Scientific Humanism” Feb. 58 *ONE* 23-24). Regarding the idea that morality should be based on fact, Richard Wollheim explained that even outside of religious dictates, people often respond negatively to homosexuality based on an “instinctive repulsion (“Books” Jun. 58 *ONE* 24-27). However, he complains that morality should not be so subjective but should be based on irrefutable facts. Underwood (writing this time as R.H. Crowther) agreed with Wollheim, contending that “mutual consent, privacy, and age” should be the basis of *all* sexual ethics and while homosexuals might not have the same standards for family life as heterosexuals, they are still capable of behaving morally (“Some Observations on Sexual Ethics” Dec. 56 *ONE* 28-30).

***ONE*’s Book Reviews & Religion**

In addition to the featured articles, *ONE* also printed fifteen reviews regarding books dealing with the topic of religion. This is 7.5% of the total reviews published by

ONE. Considering the plethora of topics covered in this recurring feature specifically, this is a significant portion. Only a few of the books reviewed were novels; the majority were non-fiction works.

Often, the reviews were encouraging to readers, describing for them a book that might help them better understand how their homosexuality could positively interact with religion. For instance, when the Gospel According to St. Thomas was published (based on the Nag Hamadi scrolls discovered in 1945), *ONE* encouraged its readers to use the gospel to help undermine some of the criticisms homosexuals have received from Biblically-based Christian churches (“Books” Dec. 59 *ONE* 27-28; “Books” Apr. 60 *ONE* 19-20). Later, Kepner reviewed *Christ and the Homosexual*, (a non-fiction book, written by a Congregational minister), which argued that churches should not force homosexuals to deny the practice of their sexuality because it is not a sin. Kepner called it the “most readable description of gay life currently in print” (“Books” May 60 *ONE* 24-25). One of the reviews of a novel claimed that it is the first book he has read where homosexual love has led men to God (“Books” Jul. 60 *ONE* 23-24).

Other books were shown to have flaws. For example, the reviewer seems to enjoy *The God Within* but finds it problematic when the author suggests that people are afraid that homosexuals will convert them (“Books” Jan. 58 *ONE* 23). Likewise, *Homosexuality and the Western Christian Tradition* is considered an important work by the reviewer but he also believes that it lets churches off the hook for some of their unjust practices against homosexuals (“Books” Nov. 55 *ONE* 19-21). Other reviews served to warn *ONE*’s readers not to waste their time. One of these reviews concerned *Morality and the Homosexual*. The reviewer says that the author’s research is shoddy, he uses only source

documents that support his ideas and ignores the rest, including Kinsey's work; the author also claims that homosexuality is sinful and homosexuals need to change ("Books" Aug. 60 *ONE* 19-20). Per *ONE*'s typical editorial policy, they sold even the books that received a negative evaluation (including *Morality and the Homosexual*) as part of *ONE*'s book service.

Conclusion

Despite the fact that a handful of clergy supported the work of *ONE* and submitted articles to the magazine, finding acceptance in Christian churches was often difficult for homosexuals. By 1963, however, there were some reasons for hope, as Fugate wrote in the December editorial. There were some churches that were becoming more liberal and accepting toward the homophile ("Editorial" Dec. 63 *ONE* 4). This was welcomed change because, as Kepner explained, many homosexuals felt a deep connection to the dominant religious traditions of their very religious nation. However, being a member of a church often still meant hiding one's sexual inclinations from most everyone. If one's same-sex sexuality became known, and especially if he or she was found to have acted upon desires, the church's doors were most often closed to the homophile.

Turning away from religion entirely, especially considering the conservative climate of post-war America, was often difficult and painful for men and women who had been raised with "a great respect and admiration for the life and teachings of Jesus" ("Editorial" Dec. 63 *ONE* 4). Still, some homosexuals were able to happily live outside of organized religion, having spiritual beliefs that were incompatible with the practices of

most Christian churches. Or, they may have relied on their own code of ethics based on the science that was available. Whatever choice the homosexual made, it was not an easy one. Krell compares men and women who deny religion in the U.S. with the early Christians who were sent to the lions for refusing to worship the Roman gods. He explains, "...when the ancient dogmas that have held a society together are themselves falling apart, the insecurity of the masses demands increased public homage to the idols" ("We Need Great Literature" May 54 *ONE* 19-23). Regarding religion and the homosexual during the era of *ONE*, the two most available options for the majority of homosexuals was to hide their true nature or become an even more pronounced target for the "Christian" masses. The writings on religion in *ONE* do not offer an easy solution, or even a high level of agreement, but they indicate a deep interest among writers and readers in religion and morality during the period.

Religion and morality are certainly important aspects of most societies, but they are not the only aspect of society with which homosexuals were interested. The next chapter deals with many of the questions that surfaced frequently in the conversations of *ONE* magazine regarding the homosexual's place in society. The uncertainty concerning how homosexuals should handle relationships, family, public personas, "gay places," and many other questions were not settled when *ONE* was being published and were given a great deal of attention by the staff and writers of the magazine.

CHAPTER 3

THE HOMOPHILE IN A HETEROSEXUAL WORLD

A recurring theme found throughout the publication of *ONE* was the uncertainty about the place of the homosexual within the dominant heterosexual culture. Homosexuals were full of questions about their place in society. Articles asked, and attempted to answer questions such as: Should homosexual men and women marry each other to fit in? Is it best for homosexuals to form lasting partnerships with each other? Can homosexuals be parents? How do homosexuals meet each other? Are there any options for the homosexual other than pairing off for a lifetime like most heterosexuals have done? What might a happy and successful homosexual life look like? Amidst all of these questions was the complaint that, in contrast to heterosexuals, there were no societal structures or traditions to support a homosexual lifestyle--whatever that might be ("Some Observations on Sexual Ethics" Dec. 56 *ONE* 28-30; "Editorial" Oct. 61 *ONE* 4; "As For Me" Jun. 62 *ONE* 25-26). One young man explained that, in his early 20s, he began to really try to understand his homosexuality, but he could find nothing to guide him; he struggled for years, shutting everyone out of this life and eventually he had to seek psychiatric help ("Case History" Apr. 61 *ONE* 16-18). From the letters *ONE* received, this was a common situation for homosexuals in the United States.

A goal of ONE, Inc., printed in nearly every issue of *ONE* from July 1954 forward, was to "promote the integration into society of such persons whose behavior and inclinations vary from current moral and social standards." There are a couple of

important points to make note of concerning this goal. First, ONE Inc.'s focus was not just on homosexuality as a state of being, but on the behavior (i.e. same sex sexual acts) that are a result of having homosexual drives. In other words, ONE wanted to help answer the question of how homosexual people are supposed to act. Second, this goal leaves room for hope. ONE wanted to help homosexuals integrate within *current* social mores; use of the word “current” implicitly implies that those standards are changeable and there is hope that society might adjust as well.

In a 1961 article, the Board of ONE updated the readers of *ONE* on the work that was being done outside of the magazine to achieve this goal. They explained that there had been a migration of homosexuals to Los Angeles over their years of operation and that many of those men and women had visited their offices requesting help. They said they had had over 16,000 contacts with homosexual men and women that resulted in keeping a record of their cases.³⁰ Additionally, they conducted 5,000 interviews in their offices (“Case History” Feb. 61 *ONE* 27-28).³¹ Considering the small size of the ONE's staff and the fact that they often had trouble responding to mail, it is unclear the nature or length of these “interviews.” Still, from this report and from the articles printed in *ONE*, it is fair to say that homosexuals were indeed anxious to know how homosexuality should affect their relations to and place within the dominant heterosexual society.

This chapter analyzes the ways in which *ONE*'s editors and contributors attempted to answer questions regarding the homosexual's place in heterosexual culture. Answering

³⁰ Some of these records may have survived to be archived. ONE National Gay & Lesbian Archives has three folders containing request for assistance that were made to ONE's Social Service division from 1953-1971. Three folders most likely does not account for 16,000 contacts though.

³¹ It is possible that records of some of these interviews also exist in the ONE National Gay & Lesbian archives because they have an entire box of ONE's research materials, two of the research projects were conducted during the time period covered by this thesis.

these questions was an element of *ONE* fulfilling its mission to assist homophiles in becoming successful in their society. Starting with the first question in the first paragraph of this chapter (i.e., Should homosexual men and women marry each other to fit in?), I will describe the ideas and opinions concerning relationships, love, monogamy, etc. that were part of the conversation in *ONE* on the homophile's place in a heterosexual world.

Should a homophile marry a member of the opposite sex?

When it came to relationships, some homosexuals took the idea of blending in so far as to wonder if they should marry a member of the opposite sex to keep up appearances. One writer explained that he often takes women out on dates just to be seen with them in his small town. However, he always ends the relationship before it had any chance of becoming serious (“The Successful Homosexual” Jul. 58 *ONE* 18-20). In the “Toward Understanding” column, Dr. Blanche Baker answered a letter from a homosexual man who was considering the possibility of marrying a woman because when he was with her, he felt accepted in his community. Dr. Baker tells him that she thinks it is a bad idea because the relationship would not be based in honesty or trust, and he might end up really hurting the woman involved (“Toward Understanding” Feb. 59 *ONE* 25-26). A few months later, she responded to another letter on the same topic, but this time from a gay man who had been married to a woman for years and it only made his loneliness worse. He had nervous breakdowns and had to go on disability for his mental health status (“Toward Understanding” Sep. 59 *ONE* 26-30).

Most of the advice concerning traditional marriage for the homosexual suggested that it was an unwise decision (“Should a Homosexual be Advised to Marry?” Sep. 62

ONE 18-19). A woman writing specifically to help parents of homosexuals encouraged them not to push their children into a marriage that is against their natural tendencies (“To the Parent of a Homosexual” May 58 *ONE* 5-8). A homosexual school teacher who wrote an “As For Me” column argued that traditional marriage would not even work for someone who was not bisexual (“As For Me” Jun. 63 *ONE* 20-22). Dr. Baker seemed to agree based on her response to a bisexual man who wrote that because he did not believe that he could have a long-term homosexual relationship with a man, he wanted to marry a woman. Her response was that he seemed to know himself and it would probably be successful as long as he was completely honest with the woman involved and it might even be best if she was in a similar situation (“Toward Understanding” Nov. 59 *ONE* 26-28). Overall, the thread that connected the ideas about traditional marriage in *ONE* was that it was not a good idea when it was completely against one’s sexual inclinations.

Should homosexuals "marry" each other?

There was less consensus regarding the question of “homosexual marriage.” The word “marriage” in this phrase has no legal connotation; homosexuals had merely appropriated a term that was commonly used to describe a life-long commitment to one other individual. However, some writers claimed that the idea of “homosexual marriage” was merely an attempt to mimic heterosexual society and it would not work for homosexuals (“Is There an Alternative” Feb. 60 *ONE* 18-19; “Toward a Rational Approach to Homosexuality” Mar. 62 *ONE* 5-11; “The Third Choice” Apr. 54 *ONE* 4-6). Two of *ONE*’s editors agreed with these outside contributors. Ross Ingersoll, a long-time member of *ONE*’s editorial staff, did not like the phrase “homosexual marriage,” seeing it

as an attempt to steal a phrase that is innately heterosexual. Kepner, though not entirely opposed to the idea of "homosexual marriage," believed that it might not be necessary. In an article on the benefits of remaining single (this time writing under the pseudonym Frank Golovitz), he claimed that "homosexual marriage" might be distracting. He argued that single people have more time to give to working for the betterment of society, especially when they do not have children. According to him, if someone enjoys the single homosexual life, that person should not be forced to conform to a lifestyle that would make him unhappy or stifle his good works ("The Single Homosexual" Apr. 58 *ONE* 6-11).

On the other hand, the stereotype of the effeminate, promiscuous homosexual man was so dominant during this time period that there was a distinct push back against the "single" homosexual. The type of behavior that members of the homophile movement thought gave them a bad name was often called "swish." This term usually meant that an individual had an appearance or mannerisms of the opposite sex and was most often used to refer to men who were effeminate (Loftin 579). The term used to describe women who were masculine was "butch" ("Ki-ki or the Butch-Femme" Jul. 60 *ONE* 6-9). The large number of readers who used these terms make it apparent that most of the homophile population knew what they meant. *ONE* magazine, even though it was considered the most radical of the three popular homophile magazines, still published more articles suggesting that homosexuals hide their inclinations, blend in, and avoid swish than articles urging acceptance for all types ("One Midwinter Institute: A Report by W. Dorr Legg" Apr. 61 *ONE* 7-8).³² Homosexual partnerships were often encouraged in *ONE*'s articles because they helped the homosexual blend in and appear not to be substantially

³² See Appendix E for number of positive v. negative "Swish" articles and letters

different than the heterosexual majority. Additionally, though I am saving a discussion of the letters from readers for Chapter 4, it is important to note that numerous men and women wrote letters to *ONE* saying how lonely they were and how much they wanted to meet someone to share their lives with. Including these letters with the many pro-marriage articles found in *ONE*, it becomes clear that the push toward long-term partnerships or "homosexual marriage" was not just a negative reaction to swish but a genuine desire on the part of many homosexuals to find a lasting relationship.³³

As a writer to Dr. Baker suggested, though, permanent partnerships were much more difficult for homosexuals. Unlike married heterosexuals, homosexuals often had a difficult time finding housing that would accept them; they often had little support from their families; they had no legal ties to one another; they found no governmental or religious sanctioning of their commitment to one another; and they often lived in homosexual communities in which affairs were numerous and sanctioned ("Toward Understanding" Dec. 59 *ONE* 23-26). Due to these dilemmas, many of the articles *ONE* printed on this topic contained practical advice on how to have a successful partnership. For instance, Jim Egan answered the question of whether or not homosexuals can have lasting relationships in the affirmative, but advised readers that they will most likely have to avoid some of the pitfalls of gay life such as bars, clubs, and vacation spots ("Homosexual Marriage" Dec. 59 *ONE* 6-9). A couple of years later, this same author wrote another article with more advice on creating a successful partnership. He said the first step is to have a lengthy discussion about monogamy, money, social life, family, goals, etc. and make sure the partners are compatible. He suggested that if two people have too many differences, it is best to end the relationship early. He also advised that

³³ See the Chapter "Reader Responses to *ONE*" for a discussion of these letters.

permanent relationships do not work for all homosexuals and if they are happier being single, they should not try to commit to a long-term partnership ("Blueprint for Partnership" Nov. 61 *ONE* 20-23). Another contributor wrote an article in support of "homosexual marriage" because his was so enjoyable. He claimed that partnerships can lead to a better, more fulfilling life for both partners. He also gave advice on how to meet someone else who wants a lasting relationship. For example, he urged readers not to sleep around very much and to spend time with other "married" homophiles. After "marriage," he encouraged homosexuals to learn to compromise, to have some shared debt, to keep clean and try not to gain weight ("Let's Push Homophile Marriage" Jun. 63 *ONE* 5-10). For obvious reasons, the idea of legalizing same-sex marriage would probably not have entered most homophiles' minds at this point in history. It certainly was not a topic that came up in any of the articles I reviewed for this study. After all, homophiles were still fighting just to be allowed to engage in sexual activity in the privacy of their own homes without fear of arrest. Regardless, the discussions of, and obvious desire for, long-term pair-bonding underscore the importance of these societal issues still in debate today.

Can homosexuals be parents?

Another topic discussed, although very rarely, was the idea of parenthood for homosexuals. Today, when individuals come out as exclusively gay or lesbian, there is not an automatic assumption that their sexuality limits their ability to be parents. Many still look forward to "settling down and having a family"--words that only heterosexuals would have used in the 1950s and 60s. In fact, in "The Single Homosexual," when Kepner argued that homosexuals are able to give more of their time to better society, he

made assumptions that are not necessarily applicable today (e.g., that heterosexual couples will have children, and homosexuals will not) (“The Single Homosexual” Apr. 58 *ONE* 6-11). In an earlier article, Kepner also commented that homosexuals would not make good parents anyway (“It Just Isn’t Natural” Aug. & Sep. 57 *ONE* 8-12). An editorial written under the name Alison Hunter,³⁴ made the same assumption. The writer contends that women can help with the world’s overpopulation problem by becoming lesbians—the implicit suggestion being that lesbians would not have children (“Editorial” Feb. 60 *ONE* 4). This was not an editorial that was popular with the readers. In another article on the possibilities of artificial insemination for homosexuals, which received much negative feedback, the editors added a note stating that medical reports have shown that lesbians cannot often get pregnant through artificial insemination (“Homosexual Procreation” Mar. 61 *ONE* 6-8). The one positive mention of a homosexual’s ability to parent was in the response of Dr. Baker to the letter from the homosexual man who explained the many difficulties homosexuals face when it comes to creating lasting partnerships. She said that she agreed with him completely, especially concerning the lack of legal support, and mentioned that she had known homosexual couples who had adopted children (“Toward Understanding” Dec. 59 *ONE* 23-26). *ONE* may have been at the cutting edge for the scholarship in this field during its time, but it is clear to scholars today that many of their assumptions concerning parenthood were erroneous.

³⁴A pseudonym that anyone on *ONE*’s editorial staff could use but was most often used by Dorr Legg. This article was written by Dorr Legg and was the reason that Stella Rush (known as Sten Russell) resigned from *ONE*’s staff (White 81).

Are there options other than "marriage" for homosexuals?

Monogamous relationships were not the only type discussed in *ONE*. A few of the writers had ideas for other options. One letter to Dr. Baker claimed that “roommates” are the best solution for homosexuals. He said that he and his “roommate” had been together for 10 years, they each had other “infatuations” over the years but always came home to one another (“Toward Understanding” Jun. 59 *ONE* 26-29). A different contributor showed how the structure of the modern family is tyrannical and unjust. In addition, children begin to leave home at just the age in which they could become helpful to their parents or other members of the family, which the writer said is nonsensical. He proposed that everyone begin to live within chosen families that he called the “house” in which members come together, not just for sex or procreation (in fact, those elements are not necessary at all) but to take care of one another (“Augmented Families” Feb. 60 *ONE* 6-9). Another suggestion was that homosexuals are better suited to living in groups because monogamy only produces jealousy when one person strays, which is bound to happen (“Is There An Alternative?” Feb. 60 *ONE* 18-19). Yet another author argued that the ability to use artificial insemination has given homosexuals the chance to remove themselves from heterosexual society entirely. He proposed that male and female homosexuals create separate groups, only coming together for purposes of procreation and once the children are born, the male children are raised in the male camp and vice versa with the female children (“Homosexual Procreation” Mar. 61 *ONE* 6-8).³⁵ One final idea, mentioned in the last chapter, was the suggestion to create a monastery just for homosexuals. The author admits that not all homosexuals would want to separate

³⁵ This idea made some of the more conservative readers of *ONE* very anxious, not only because it was so radical but because it is the kind of idea that they believed would give them a bad reputation with heterosexual society.

themselves from society, but for those who did, the ability to live and work together, engaging in sexual relationships of their choice, might be ideal (“How About a Homophile Monastery?” Oct. 62 *ONE* 24-25).

How do homosexuals meet each other?

Of course, for any of these types of relationships to develop, homosexuals had to find a way to meet one another within the confines of the heterosexual world in which they lived. The ways in which homosexuals, men especially, met one another during the 1950s and 60s was through bars, public parks, bathhouses, gay vacation spots, etc. However, these venues were often criticized in the pages of *ONE* for promoting promiscuity and shallow relationships; additionally, it was thought that they could often be hotbeds for public sex and flagrant behavior (“Some Observations on Sexual Ethics” Dec. 56 *ONE* 28-30; “Edward Denison’s Letter to Dear Young Cousin” Mar. 62 *ONE* 24-25). Articles regarding dissatisfaction with the gay bar scene abounded in *ONE* (“The Problem of Meeting People” Feb. 58 *ONE* 20-21; “More on ‘The Problem of Meeting People’” Jun. 58 *ONE* 20-21; “Gay Beach” Jul. 58 *ONE* 5-10; “Letter to a Newcomer” Feb. 54 *ONE* 18-19; “Some Observations on Sexual Ethics” Dec. 56 *ONE* 28-30; “The Older Homosexual” Jun. & Jul 57 *ONE* 5-8; “Ki-Ki or the Butch-Femme” Jul. 60 *ONE* 6-9; “Know Your Bartender” Jan. 61 *ONE* 6-13; “Editorial” Jun. 62 *ONE* 4-5). Additionally, in a 1959 Editorial, *ONE* claimed that they did not support criminal activity and then in 1963 printed yet another piece discouraging homosexuals from engaging in public sex because it hurts the majority of homosexuals who do not engage in this type of behavior (“Editorial” Aug. 59 *ONE* 4; “The Homosexual and the Police” May 63 *ONE*

21-25). None of the other articles seemed to point out the hypocrisy of these views or note that these ideas do not convey concern or understanding for the types of lives that many homosexuals were forced to live in this time period. First of all, same-sex sexual activity was illegal in every state, so how could *ONE* say, on the one hand, that they wanted homosexuals to live happier, more adjusted lives, and on the other hand, implicitly suggest that they abstain from all sexual activity (which was the only way for a homosexual to truly avoid illegal behavior)? Additionally, society was so negative toward homosexuality that many people may not have had the option of taking anyone home (either because of roommates, family, neighbors, inability to pay for a hotel, etc.) so public sex might have been the only recourse for having a sex life but also keeping it hidden from their family and friends.

Overall, *ONE* was certainly not anti-gay bar, beach, club, etc. In fact, they ran an article on a speech given by Dr. Evelyn Hooker on her research regarding the male homosexual. On the whole, Dr. Hooker concluded that the values of the majority of homosexuals matched the values of the dominant society, but a disproportionate number still frequented “gay” places, even when they were in happy relationships (“Summary of Paper” Apr. 60 *ONE* 28). So, despite the protests from some editors and readers, it is clear that gay hotspots were a part of homosexual life. *ONE*’s staff also published numerous articles about bar raids and a defense of the “gay bar” written by Julian Underwood. He argued that bars are one of the homosexual’s only means of escape from loneliness and that sex is no more prevalent in gay bars than it is in heterosexual bars (“The Gay Bar” Feb. 58 *ONE* 5-8). Additionally, a couple of the articles listed above, though dissatisfied with the bar scene, also accepted it as an inevitable facet of

homosexual life ("Know Your Bartender" Jan. 61 *ONE* 6-13; "Edward Denison's Letter to Dear Young Cousin" Mar. 62 *ONE* 24-25). Gay bars, beaches, clubs, etc. were the only places that homosexuals were able to come together en masse and begin to build a sense of community that might lead to shared identity. However, they were not necessarily desirable for the entire population.

For those who found homosexual gathering spots undesirable, more options were coveted. Is not that these men and women had no sense of community, but for many reasons, they did not feel comfortable in "gay places." Two ideas for other ways in which homosexuals could meet one another received the most response from readers.³⁶ In September 1959, *ONE*'s editors explained that they had often received requests from their readers and members to create a pen pal club. Jim Kepner (writing as Lyn Pedersen) wrote an article supporting the idea, claiming that it would be a good way for homosexuals to meet each other and many European homophile organizations had them ("Why Not a Pen Pal Club?" Sep. 59 *ONE* 5-8). Dorr Legg (writing under the name most people knew him by, William Lambert) responded with an article predicting nothing but doom for *ONE* if they engaged in a service that was really only a means through which people would meet for sex ("Sick, Sick, Sick" Sep. 59 *ONE* 9-13). *ONE*'s editors include a note at the end of the article that their attorney advised them against creating a pen pal club and they would not be sponsoring one, which was a great disappointment to many of *ONE*'s readers. Another idea proposed was that of creating some sort of a social club/society ("As For Me" Mar. 63 *ONE* 22-23; "The Problem of Meeting People" Feb.

³⁶ At this point, only an initial presentation of the ideas is provided. The readers' responses will be discussed in more detail in the chapter "Reader Responses to *ONE*."

58 *ONE* 20-21; “More on ‘The Problem of Meeting People’” Jun. 58 *ONE* 20-21).³⁷

Geraldine Jackson calls her idea “Homosexuals Anonymous” and, though there is a component to her argument regarding homosexuals helping one another, it is clear from the full article that lack of unity among homosexuals was something she considered problematic, which was why she suggested the group (“As For Me” Jun. 62 *ONE* 25-26). Later scholars like D’Emilio and Streimatter agree with her assessment of the need for unity. One other contribution to *ONE* worth mentioning was an article that was basically a utopian fantasy set in the year 2060. In that future, homosexual sex acts are legal in the major cities and an organization called the “Homosexual Aid Society” not only helps homosexuals acclimate when they move from smaller towns, but it has a matchmaking service to help those homosexuals who want to find a partner. It is meaningful that the wildest dreams a homosexual could have were at least partially focused on creating an easier way for people to meet each other.

ONE's Successful Homosexuals

In an attempt to give their readers examples of men and women who were well-adjusted, *ONE* ran a series of articles at first called “The Successful Homosexual” and later “Case History.” The recurring column, “As For Me,” also contained a few life stories of homosexuals. The men highlighted in these columns most often had professional jobs (e.g., policeman, carpenter, teacher), and almost all engaged in homosexual activities under grave secrecy.³⁸ A.E. Smith, a frequent contributor,

³⁷ Some of these writers may have been unaware of the Mattachine Society or Daughters of Bilitis. There may also have lived in a city in which M.S. and D.O.B. had no branches. It is also possible that what they really wanted was a group that was run by *ONE*, Inc. because of their more progressive views.

³⁸ None of the stories were about women.

explained that this was necessary, positing that 95% of homosexuals hide it or they would lose their jobs (“Coming Out” Jun. 62 *ONE* 6-8).³⁹ One story was about a man who was open about his homosexuality at work and was fired from his job for it; eventually he found a new job where he could be honest about himself, but he went through a great deal of stress first (“Case History” Aug. 61 *ONE* 19-21). It is, perhaps, ironic that most of the editors used their own names on the masthead of *ONE* but the articles published did not often suggest living in such an openly homosexual way. The concept of hiding one's sexuality as a factor in a more successful life most likely served as a deterrent to the process of building group identity or community. There cannot be social movement based on group identity unless individuals are willing to openly affiliate with the group.

Conclusion

Navigating the way through a heterosexual world as a homophile was difficult and confusing. No cultural patterns existed to help them understand their sexual or gender inclinations or provide an example to follow. In a more accepting culture, the ability to choose between the many types of relationships and family styles presented by the contributors and staff of *ONE* would be ideal. But, in the mid-20th century traditional families were idealized and considered the only moral, valuable basis of society (Master 243). Even when they tried to emulate traditional family life, homosexuals were outsiders, either because a monogamous relationship just did not feel right for them, or because it was not easy for homosexuals to have children, or because members of their community would not accept a couple of the same sex. Those who were able to blend

³⁹ This was not a statistic he gave with any supporting data, merely his belief about the situation.

into society well, appearing “normal,” lived in constant fear that their sexual proclivities might become known to outsiders. On the other hand, those who did not care to blend in were ostracized by heterosexual society, and often other homosexuals. There were no easy answers but *ONE* tried to print every idea that had any possibility of clarifying the situation for its readers.

The conversation about the homosexual's place in society was difficult and fraught with controversy. Had the conversation been relegated only to the articles *ONE* printed, it would have been rather one-sided. Luckily, *ONE* had thousands of readers who joined the conversation. The next chapter focuses on what the readers thought was important in regards to religion and their place in society. Though many of the ideas and opinions were similar, certain components of the readers interests were not adequately addressed in the articles of *ONE*.

CHAPTER 4 THE READERS OF *ONE*

In a 1958 Editorial, Don Slater wrote, "As editors of *ONE* Magazine we feel that we sustain an unusual relationship with our readers...In a real sense, the readers and the editors are 'we'. For *ONE* Magazine is the publication of a very special interest group...Therefore, the readers may logically feel that the Magazine belongs to them" ("Editorial" Dec. 58 *ONE* 4). It does appear as though many of the readers felt this way. They were not shy with criticism, praise, suggestions, or just stories about their lives. I was able to review 1,261 letters from January 1954 to December 1953 and it is clear that the readers of *ONE* felt connected to "their" magazine and were in conversation with the editors and contributors.⁴⁰ In fact, 34% of the letters mentioned a specific article or articles to which they were responding. A smaller percentage engaged in conversations within the "Letters" column.⁴¹

Letters came from all over the United States and around the world. Letters came from most European countries, but also far away countries such as South Africa and Papua New Guinea. In the U.S., the states of California and New York sent at least three times as many letters as the other states, which makes sense because San Francisco, Los

⁴⁰ It is important to note that once in awhile an article received so many responses that the editors would include those letters in a column called "Readers on Writers." I include those letters, as well as those in the "Letters to the Editors" column in my analysis.

⁴¹ See Appendix D for more statistical information on the letters

Angeles, and New York City were the centers of gay life during this era.⁴² I analyzed the themes in terms of eastern v. western United States, and also California v. New York but found no significant differences in the topics being discussed between these different geographical locations.

The discussions found in the letters were sometimes on the topics that the articles also engaged, but not always. Regarding the seven themes I tracked (causes of homosexuality; "swish" behavior; women in *ONE*; repudiation of societal authorities; religion; homosexual connections over time and culture; and the homosexual's place in society), the percentages between the articles and letters often seem very similar. For instance, 2.53% of the articles and 2.01% of the letters included a discussion of the causes of homosexuality. Most importantly for this chapter, however, are the themes of religion and place in society.

This chapter will begin with an assessment of the readers' ideas concerning religion. In many cases, the readers' responses mirror the ideas found in the articles. However, the readers actually discuss religion even more than the articles did (9.59% of letters, 6.55% of articles) and they came up with more creative ideas for spirituality outside of the Christian faith. This chapter also contains the previously untold story of *ONE*'s readers' feelings about how they fit in society. This is the one theme with much higher percentages of discussion in the letters section v. the articles (12.29% of letters, 6.25% of articles). In the readers' responses to this theme, it becomes very clear that many homosexuals did not feel connected to their minority yet; the unity that is important for social movements was lacking for some. Additionally, there is a brief discussion of the topic of "swish" behavior and how it relates to the theme of the homosexual's place in

⁴² See Appendix D for the number of letters and percentages received from each state and country.

society. Because these topics have already been discussed at length in Chapters 2 and 3, I will allow the readers to speak for themselves more in this chapter.⁴³ I think that this is important because, although Master and White sometimes quote from the letters found in *ONE*, they do not analyze the letters apart from the other content, as an important component of the conversations taking place. The readers' voices and opinions added much to *ONE*, and the magazine would not have been the same without them. Without the reader's voices, it would have been much less apparent that many readers were feeling and extreme sense of loneliness/isolation and fewer ideas about religion would have been aired. Finally, this chapter will consider topics outside of the seven themes I tracked that give evidence of the readers' belief that *ONE* really was their magazine. Feeling this sense of ownership and pride was an important step in becoming connected to the homosexual minority.

The Readers and Religion

The articles of *ONE* contain a great deal of resistance to the idea that homosexuality and same-sex sexual activity are sinful. While the letters certainly contain those sentiments as well, some of the homosexual population had internalized the idea of their own sinfulness as is apparent in the letters. One letter writer asks them to cancel his subscription because he read in 1 Corinthians that homosexuality is wrong ("Letter from Wooster, Ohio" Jun. 54 *ONE* 27). Another argues that God would not have destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah if homosexuality were not sinful ("Letter from Mr. G" Sep. 63 *ONE* 30). Another letter asks, "Does it hurt us to admit that we are sinners? Even heterosexuals are sinners. If you do not want to admit to sin how can you find any

⁴³ See Appendix E for a comparison between letters and articles

meaning in any religion?...Perhaps the real reason for antagonism on the part of the homosexual towards the church lies in the fact that he actually means to find some excuse or justification for his promiscuity" ("Letter from Mr. S" Dec. 61 *ONE* 29).

In addition, letters came from men and women who felt excluded and discriminated against by the Church ("Letter from MA" Apr. 54 *ONE* 28; "Letter from Mr. M" Mar. 60 *ONE* 29; "Letter from Mr. S" Aug. 60 *ONE* 30; "Letter from Mr. L" Sep. 60 *ONE* 29; "Letter from Mr. S" Dec. 60 *ONE* 29-30; "Letter from Mr. B" Dec. 60 *ONE* 29). One particularly jaded reader warns, "Don't kid yourselves. Take it from one who was brought up in it, who has heard the dialectic and knows the type of mind, when it comes to the homosexual the Roman Catholic Church knows that there are more subtle ways to kill the human mind and spirit than by poison or ax" ("Letter from Mr. H" Aug. 60 *ONE* 30).

Despite the feelings of rejection, there were those who clung to their Christian faith ("Letter from Mr. L" Aug. 60 *ONE* 30; "Letter from Mr. H" May 62 *ONE* 29; "Letter from Mr. W" May 62 *ONE* 29; "Letter from Mr. H" May 63 *ONE* 31). A particularly poignant letter laments, "I want to love, because it is my nature to love deeply. I want to live close to God and in harmony with His ministers and His church...It would seem that among all His servants there must be somewhere the priest, the rabbi, the minister whom He has enlightened and to whom He has given the charge to guide us on our way" ("Letter from Mr. L" Jan. 61 *ONE* 32).

As in the articles, some readers attempted to interpret the Bible in non-traditional ways ("Letter from Mr. F" Mar. 61 30; "Letter from Mr. K" Dec. 63 *ONE* 31). One letter argued that St. Paul was writing for his time and that the Bible had nothing to say about

the modern situation ("Letter from Brother Grundy" Jun. 58 *ONE* 17). Other letters made the same claim as some of the articles, arguing that Jesus taught love and made no negative remarks concerning homosexuality ("Letter from Hamden, CT" Jul. 54 *ONE* 25; "Letter from Mr. G" Jun. 62 *ONE* 30; "Letter from Mr. M" May 63 *ONE* 32). One lengthy letter in response to the article, "St. Paul on Sodomy" even quoted from the Bible to support this idea. According to the letter, Jesus said, "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another as I have loved you...Love the Lord thy God above all else, and thy neighbor as thyself" (qtd. in "Letter from Christina Midence Valentine" Jun. 58 *ONE* 18-19).

Additionally, many writers protested that their sins were certainly no worse than any other, so there is no logical reason they should be kept out of churches ("Letter from Mr. S" Mar. 59 *ONE* 28-29; "Letter from Mr. S" Mar. 60 *ONE* 29; "Letter from Mr. H" Dec. 60 *ONE* 29). A man complains:

The society we live in believes we are demented or sick. How about the police chief who believes in beating and tormenting those he arrests into giving and signing confessions, or the over-zealous politician who will use unscrupulous methods to achieve his goals? Are these to be considered individuals with healthy minds?

They claim we have no religion. We have religion where it belongs, in the heart. Oh yes, you will find many heterosexuals in the neighborhood church or synagogue every week, but that doesn't necessarily make them the holiest of mortals ("Letter from Mr. F" Dec. 62 *ONE* 30).

As noted in Chapter 2, a few of the articles in *ONE* were written by members of the clergy. The support from ministers of many different faith traditions is even more evident in the letters column. No fewer than fifteen ministers, priest, rabbis, or other clergy wrote in with words of encouragement and support for *ONE* and the homosexual

group in America.⁴⁴ One minister said that he has performed marriage ceremonies for homosexual couples ("Letter from Rev.--" Aug. 59 *ONE* 29-30). The hopeful tone of James Fugate's December 1963 editorial is echoed in the words of a homosexual priest who wrote in response to the many letters from men and women discouraged with religion. He says:

I would like to give a few words of encouragement to some of my brothers and sisters in the Letters Column if I might...While it is true that Church, along with Society, does condemn us who are gay, there are a few churches throughout this wonderful land of ours that leave the doors of the church open. It is also true that there are clergymen, priests, ministers, and rabbis that are gay and capable to advise and counsel us in difficult times, for they understand the problem of the homosexual and (like myself) are willing and sympathetic to lend an ear ("Letter from Father S." Aug. 62 *ONE* 31).

The idea that turning away from traditional religions did not mean rejecting all spirituality surfaced in the letters as well. A reader from California explains, "Churches are locked and barred with iron doors. To whom does one turn in the hour of need? Thank God, I can still communicate with God. He at least is there when I call" ("Letter from Mr. M" May 62 *ONE* 29). Some other suggestions for new spiritual or religious traditions included the occult, parapsychology, scientific humanism, eastern religions, Christian Science, reincarnation, and phallic worship ("Letter from Mrs. E" Sep. 55 *ONE* 28; "Letter from Mr. O" Dec. 57 *ONE* 30; "Letter from Miss S" May 58 *ONE* 30; "Letter from Christina Midence Valentine" Jun. 58 *ONE* 18-19; "Letter from Mr. R" May 63 *ONE* 31-32; "Letter from Mr. C" Sep. 63 *ONE* 30).

There were also readers who wrote to say that they agreed with the articles on ethics and morality, considering themselves moral individuals ("Letter from Mr. P" Feb.

⁴⁴ Letters from ministers, priests, and rabbis in the "Letters" column of the following issues: Mar. 55, Jun. & Jul. 56, Oct. & Nov. 56, Apr. 57, Oct. & Nov. 57, May 58, Jun. 58, Aug. 58, Aug. 59, Jan. 60, Jun. 60, Aug. 62, Sep. 62, Oct. 63

58 *ONE* 30). Again, there were those who explained that they have no use for religion ("Letter from "Mr. S" May 59 *ONE* 30; "Letter from Mr. J" Feb. 61 *ONE* 31; "Letter from Mr. K" Dec. 61 *ONE* 29). Jim Egan, a frequent contributor, combined these ideas when he wrote:

...to be "moral" in Western society, an act must have the sanction of religion. Thus, man is required to re-shape his nature and cram it into the artificial shape dictated by the parasitic mystics who have managed to prey upon his superstitions and gain a strangle a strangle-hold over his every thought and action. The man who would be free and his own master, on the other hand, rejects utterly the psalm-singing, Bible-thumping hypocrites and re-shapes morality to fit his individual nature and needs. He sees that any act is a moral and right act if it brings pleasure and gratification to the actor and does no hurt or harm of any kind to any other human being ("Letter from Jim Egan of Canada" Jun. 60 *ONE* 8).

It is no surprise that the conversations about religion in the letters column were similar to that of the articles in the magazine, as many were a direct response to those articles. It is interesting to note however, that while religious topics were mentioned in 6.55% of the articles, they were mentioned in 9.59% of the letters. This difference shows that there was a substantial interest in the topic of religion, and leaves one wondering if the readers might have been even more interested in it than the editors. Whether or not this is true, it is clear that discussing religious topics was important to those who created *ONE* and those who consumed it.

The Readers and their Place in Society

Many ideas discussed in the articles of *ONE* regarding the homosexual's place in society did surface in the "Letters" column. Disillusionment with the gay bar scene was a prominent theme ("Letter from San Francisco, Calif." Jun. 54 *ONE* 27; "Letter from New York City" Mar. 55 *ONE* 42-43; "Letter from Mr. H" Jul. 63 *ONE* 30). One letter writer,

though dissatisfied with bars, also felt that the poor conditions were not the homosexuals' fault, but society's ("Letter from Mr. D" Sep. 55 *ONE* 26). Others explained that bars were a part of their life. One stated that he goes to "gay" places "in order to feel closer, and be closer to those of [his] kind" ("Letter from Mr. R" May 58 *ONE* 31). Just like the editors, readers also sent notices of bar closures and persecutions to their way of life.⁴⁵ This conversation makes apparent that bars and clubs had the potential to unify the homosexual population, leading to that shared sense of identity around sexuality that became so important in later years. However, according to their numerous letters, many homosexuals avoided the bar scene so that potential was not fully realized.

Other ideas that were discussed in the articles were also important to readers. The topic of homosexual partnership was discussed in the letters section as well, both in favor for and against it ("Letter from Mr. S" Jul. 58 *ONE* 30; "Letter from Mr. B" Apr. 59 *ONE* 30-31; "Letter from Mr. H" Mar. 60 *ONE* 30; "Letter from Mr. H" Apr. 60 *ONE* 31; "Letter from Mr. G" May 62 *ONE* 29; "Letter from Mr. S" May 63 *ONE* 31; "Letter from R.H. Stuart" Aug. 63 *ONE* 29). The importance of hiding one's sexual desires was an important topic to the readers ("Letter from Mr. H" Sep. 62 *ONE* 26; "Letter from Mr. L" Oct. 62 *ONE* 30). Parenting only came up twice in the letters I reviewed (and then in direct response to a specific article on the topic) even though it was discussed a little more in the articles ("Letter from Helen Sanders of the D.O.B." Oct. 58 *ONE* 25; "Letter from Mr. S" Feb. 59 *ONE* 29). Traditional marriage was only mentioned once, in response to the article which claimed it was a bad idea--the letter writer was about to make that mistake but changed his mind ("Letter from Mr. F" Dec. 62 *ONE* 31).

⁴⁵ In the letters column: 9/60, New York; 10/60, New York; 1/61 New Orleans, LA; 2/61 Washington DC; 11/61 Florida; 11/61 Dallas

However, while these topics were a part of the conversation, the letters column, in regards to the homosexual's place in society, was dominated by the subject that inspired the articles on "Homosexual Anonymous" and pen pal clubs: Loneliness.

The discussion of whether or not there was anything *ONE* could do to help alleviate the isolation that many homophiles felt began early and lasted throughout the time period. In fact, it was such a popular topic that in my analysis of the letters, I felt it necessary to track loneliness separately (though admittedly things like dissatisfaction with gay bars may have been part of the problem of loneliness so it cannot be entirely separated from the larger topic). Letters concerning loneliness account for 7.37% of the total letters I reviewed. When included with the larger category of the homosexuals' ability to fit into society, this category is 12.29% of the letters *ONE* received, which makes it the second-most discussed theme in *ONE*'s letters. In a country with the habit of making any minority feel isolated and alone, it is not surprising that this topic was so important to *ONE*'s readers. However, the importance also makes clear that while homosexuals did not yet feel fully connected to one another, they wanted to be.

Some readers wrote to *ONE* to say that the magazine in itself helped relieve some of their feelings of isolation ("Letter from Quebec, Canada" Jun. 55 *ONE* 20; "Letter from Mr. R" Oct. & Nov. 56 *ONE* 38; "Letter from Mr. N" Oct. 58 *ONE* 29). Others felt that they needed something more than just words on a page. As early as November 1955, *ONE* began to receive complaints that it was not doing enough to connect its members. Mr. A writes, "I have not renewed my subscription because I frankly felt that the magazine did nothing for those of our particular world...One of the greatest needs of the type we represent is social contact with those of us who speak the same language by

means of clubs, pen pals, etc. You provide none of that" ("Letter from Mr. A" Nov. 55 *ONE* 28). This letter is important, not just because of the complaint, but because it shows that he believed that there was something shared between all homosexuals, they have a "particular world" and "speak the same language." In his opinion, they just had not come together, to unite through these shared elements yet and *ONE* was not helping.

Some of the letters did not address a sense of community, but total isolation. One reader says, "It seems impossible to meet anyone with whom I may make friends. Living completely alone with no one to talk with, no one who would understand is like not living at all" ("Letter from Mr. T" Nov. 55 *ONE* 29). Another complains, "I am 26, very lonely and disgusted. I'm so alone, can't seem to find anyone to care for me or care what I feel" ("Letter from Mr. E" Jan. 58 *ONE* 30). The men and women living in small towns seemed to struggle with this more acutely than those in cities. The two letters just quoted from, for example, were from a "small town" (the name was redacted before printing) and New Albany, Indiana.

In response to what the editors claimed were "hundreds" of letters they received monthly, they included a note in November 1955 stating that they do their best to answer all of the letters personally, but they cannot, according to their Constitution and By-Laws, "assume the duties of a pen pal club or an introduction center" ("Editor's Note" Nov. 55 *ONE* 29). They also explained that they do not give anyone access to any information on their mailing list in order to protect the privacy of their subscribers. Still the letters poured in, many of which were printed in *ONE*. As such, *ONE* included more editor's notes in March and June 1958 saying that they will absolutely not forward letters from one subscriber to another ("Editor's Note" Mar. 58 *ONE* 29; "Editor's Reply" Jun. 58

ONE 30). In September of the same year, they included a rather defensive note maintaining that they had never suggested *ONE* was going to help homophiles meet one another; even though European homophile organizations might offer the service, they did not feel as though they were equipped to do so ("Editor's Reply" Sep. 58 *ONE* 30). I do not know if they saw a decline in the number of letters received in their office after 1958, but they continued to print letters from readers complaining that they were lonely and wanted help. Finally, in January 1959 they started printing a notice at the top of each of the "Letters" columns warning readers, "Under no circumstances do the editors forward letters from readers to other persons nor do they answer correspondence making such requests."

Perhaps the readers remained confused about *ONE*'s stance for so long because they did continue to print letters like the one from a young man in Norway who wrote because he "want[s] to find a friend in the U.S.A. on [sic] 40-45 years old. I am very blond with blue eyes and my hobbies are music, theater and ballet. If your Magazine can help me with this should I be very grateful." With this letter, they included the young man's photograph ("Letter from Mr. D" May 58 *ONE* 31). *ONE* also printed the letters asking for them to forward names of other readers or requests for "lonely hearts clubs" ("Letter from Mr. B" Aug. 59 *ONE* 30; "Letter from Miss F" Aug. 59 *ONE* 30). Then, in September 1959 *ONE* printed the two articles with opposing views on starting a pen pal club. It was this set of articles that elicited the highest number of responses in the history of *ONE* to an article. They began receiving and printing responses to it in October 1959 and the letters on this topic did not stop coming for over a year, the majority of which were in favor of the idea. However, *ONE*, Inc. (with Dorr Legg in the lead, the author of

the anti-pen pal club article) was never really considering starting one. From the beginning, Legg was extremely conscious of their lawyer's advice and would not have risked the future of *ONE*. The readers often became frustrated with *ONE* for giving readers false hope. One reader exclaimed, "You were downright cruel! Don't you realize that these are two lonely, unhappy kids? Shame on you *ONE*!" ("Letter from Miss W" Jun. 58 *ONE* 29). Another letter writer angrily responded to the pen pal controversy by accusing *ONE* of "dangling like a carrot" the service "in front of the sometimes glinting eyes of certain readers." He goes on to say "It seems to me, gentlemen, that unless you mean definitely to go ahead with the project, you are playing (calling a spade a spade) a completely rotten trick on these young men and women in ever having brought up the idea at all" ("Letter from Mr. R" Apr. 60 *ONE* 30). After the "Homosexuals Anonymous" debate, another reader called *ONE* magazine "a total waste" for doing nothing constructive to help homosexuals ("Letter from Mr. A" Apr. 62 *ONE* 31). I am not sure why *ONE*'s editors continued to print letters from men and women requesting to be connected to other subscribers, and it is understandable that some of the readers thought it was unfair. Perhaps, though, it goes back to *ONE*'s decision to print everything they could and let the truth come out through conversation. At any rate, for a historian, knowing that connections were so desirable during this time period is important information.

In addition, not all of the letters on the topic of loneliness were so controversial or melancholy. Some letters were meant to chide the other letter writers for being so negative ("Letter from Mr. F" Dec. 60 *ONE* 31). A reader from Australia observes, "Most homosexuals take themselves far too seriously. Surely it is a negative approach to be

constantly searching for a lover. The prime importance in life is to enjoy living. There are so many wonderful things to do it amazes me how dull people get" ("Letter from Mr. H" Nov. 59 *ONE* 29). Mr. B writes, "...I wish you would tell these poor souls who moan about being lonely to just quit being so damn selfish. Instead of sitting around feeling so sorry because Prince (or Princess) Charming doesn't discover them, tell them to get out and be friendly with everyone with whom they come in contact. They will be surprised how many of them will respond" ("Letter from Mr. B" Feb. 60 *ONE* 31).

Still, these letters were few compared to the number from readers complaining that bars were an unsatisfactory place to meet partners, that their small town had no meeting places for homosexuals, that they felt unable to be open enough about their homosexuality to meet other homosexuals, etc. Finding romance is never easy, even for those whom society completely supports in the endeavor, and this was a particularly difficult time for homosexuals to break free of their isolation. In addition, not all of the letter writers were necessarily interested in finding romance, some just wanted to be able to write to someone who understood them. One woman wrote from Winnipeg, Manitoba saying, "I felt so sorry for the young girl in Sidney, Australia. I too have been lonely at her age although things have changed in the last four years for me. If she would care to correspond with me I'll be most pleased if you would give her my name and address" ("Letter from Miss S" Jun. 58 *ONE* 29). This woman was probably under no illusions that she would ever meet the young woman from Australia but she felt a connection to her situation. Certainly these are the seeds of shared identity that *ONE* helped plant.

To Swish or Not to Swish, is that the Question?

When this study began, I was originally tracking seven themes that seemed to reoccur often during my preliminary review of the magazine and secondary literature. During my more in-depth analysis, I came to realize that there is a connection between the question "Should homosexuals embrace "swish"?" and "How does the homosexual fit into society?" Falling into the category of "swish" usually meant that one had the appearance or mannerisms of the opposite gender (Loftin 579). Many of the homophiles who embraced traditional American values and wanted to live "normal" lives were upset that a small number of their group were seemingly making it more difficult for them. They wanted the heterosexual world to see that they were not really any different so that they would be accepted in the dominant society. One letter explains the connection between these two ideas very well in stating, "There is no reason on God's green earth why a homosexual has to dress differently from other people...I believe we are the same as other people most of the way. This sameness, not differentness, should be stressed, both to ourselves and to the outside world" ("Letter from Mr. P" May 60 *ONE* 29). The idea of a homosexual "identity" was foreign to this man and he was not alone. Many gay men and lesbian women of this era had no desire to be different, except in their sexual activities which, as another reader explains, were just *part* of who she was. She insists, "I do not wish to be known as a capital 'H' homosexual or a capital 'L' lesbian...I do not consider my sexual activity or preference to the most important single aspect of my being" ("Letter from Miss S" Apr. 57 *ONE* 22). Shared group identity was beginning to emerge and became important to the gay liberation movement in the 1970s; but, as these letters illustrate, in the 1950s and 60s, not everyone believed that their sexuality

constituted an identity.

The idea that homosexuals felt the need to hide their sexual desires and avoid swish is mentioned in Chapter 3 because of its connection to this topic. In the articles *ONE* published, half took a negative stance toward this topic. In the letters, the percentage was up to 67.15% for negative responses to swish, most making the argument that swishes were destroying the homosexuals' public image. Furthermore, the letter writers felt much freer with name-calling than did the authors of the articles. In the letters section, men and women who did not embrace traditional dress or mannerisms were called "promiscuous," a "neurotic fringe," "flits," "pansies," "loud obvious type," "wife," "butch," "effeminate," "outlandish," "flaming queens," "trouble-makers," "swishy bitches," "disgusting," and "limp-wristed fags."⁴⁶ The men and women not in this group, who believed they were a majority of the homosexuals in the world, often made statements that they were the "better type of invert," they understood "correct behavior," had "standards above the gutter," were "discreet," "sensible," or "more conservative" ("Letter from Mr. D" Sep. 55 *ONE* 26; "Letter from Mr. M" Dec. 57 *ONE* 30; "Letter from Mr. R of Miami" Mar. 58 *ONE* 13; "Letter from Helen Sanders of the D.O.B." Oct. 58 *ONE* 25; "Letter from Mr. M" Mar. 59 *ONE* 29; "Letter from Miss R" Oct. 59 *ONE* 31). One of the most negative diatribes came from New York, complaining: "As far as sex goes I too share the opinion that it belongs in private, behind closed doors, and **nowhere else**. The small minority of peephole seekers, toilet queens, screaming faggots and other forms of extremists **must be rooted out at once** to prevent further rumors from

⁴⁶ The reference list is long so I am going to include it here: "Letter from Los Angeles, CA" Jul. 54 *ONE* 26; "Letter from Mr. P" Sep. 55 *ONE* 27; "Letter from Mr. K" May 58 *ONE* 31; "Letter from Mr. D" Oct. 58 *ONE* 30; "Letter from Mr. C" May 58 *ONE* 30; "Letter from Mr. P" Sep. 62 *ONE* 27; "Letter from Mr. C" Jan. 59 *ONE* 29; "Letter from Mr. M" Mar. 59 *ONE* 29; "Letter from Mr. X" Apr. 61 *ONE* 29; "Letter from Mr. A" Mar. 62 *ONE* 29; "Letter from Mr. B" Nov. 63 *ONE* 31)

spreading" ("Letter from Mr. B" Apr. 59 *ONE* 29).⁴⁷

Not every mention of diverse types of behavior was condescending or negative though. The letters in support of free expression were certainly fewer, but they often made the argument that homosexuals needed to accept each other before they could expect the rest of the world to follow ("Letter from Mr. R" Mar. 59 *ONE* 29; "Letter from Mr. C" Aug. 62 *ONE* 29-30; "Letter from Mr. G" Sep. 63 *ONE* 30). One of these writers explains, "I cannot see how we can strive for and expect tolerance from others when we do not have tolerance for our own kind. Perhaps she [Author of "Why Do They Persecute Us So?"] would have a cure-all solution for our racial problems if only scientists would invent a pill to turn everyone the same color" ("Letter from Mr. S" May 59 *ONE* 30-31). To these writers, homosexuals were a specific group or "kind" and, like other minority groups, variation among members existed. Other letter writers were less worried about the group, and more concerned with not pretending to be something they were not ("Letter from Mr. A" Sep. 55 *ONE* 30; "Letter from Mr. C" Mar. 58 *ONE* 30; "Letter from Mr. D" Feb. 63 *ONE* 30).

The topic of "swish" was prominent in the articles and letters of *ONE*, though it is not one of the themes I chose to focus on for this thesis because it has been discussed so thoroughly by many of the other scholars. However, its connection to the way that homosexuals interacted with the dominant culture of the 1950s and 60s made it worth mentioning. Additionally, the fact that the readers took a more negative view of the subject than did the editors or contributors to *ONE* made it an important topic to cover briefly.

⁴⁷ Bold items printed that way in the original text

The Magazine Belongs to You: Conversation Blossoms

More than anything else, the "Letters" column shows that homosexuals wanted to be in conversation with one another. Readers responded to articles, sometimes directly addressing the author or the name of the article. Readers responded to other readers' letters. *ONE*'s editors responded to the mail received and some of the responses to their responses were printed. A great example of this type of "conversation" began when a reader from New Orleans wrote to say that he had recently converted to Catholicism and no longer wanted to receive the magazine because the Bible calls homosexuality a sin ("Letter from Mr. G" Sep. 63 *ONE* 30). Dorr Legg must have responded to his letter with some of the reinterpretations of the Bible often discussed in *ONE* because the reader wrote again three months later, addressing his letter to Legg. ("Letter from Mr. G" Dec. 63 *ONE* 32). If the editors felt that their response was important enough for everyone to hear, they often included it immediately following the letter. An example is a letter they received from a man who wanted to know why they had not told another letter writer about the New York Mattachine Society when he inquired if they had offices in New York ("Letter from Mr. D" Feb. 59 *ONE* 27). The editor's reply was that they are a separate organization and they believe their approach is best, and that they do not necessarily endorse the Mattachine Society ("Editor's Reply" Feb. 59 *ONE* 27).

Sometimes, conversations moved back and forth between letters and articles more than once. One conversation began in the letters section when a reader asked, "Now, will someone kindly tell me why homosexuality should be accepted but child molestation condemned, despite the fact that the urge in each case is imperative and its denial wreaks physical, mental, and moral havoc [an argument often used to support homosexual sex

acts] and also that the love an older person feels for a child, even though sexual in nature, can be as beautiful as that which two homosexuals feel for each other?" ("Letter from Miss V" Feb. 59 *ONE* 27). Readers responded to this letter in the "Letters" column, and a contributor wrote an article for the May 1959 issue arguing that consent needs to be a factor in sexuality, and children cannot consent, so homosexuality and child molestation are very different ("Between Consenting Adults" May 59 *ONE* 12-14). Apparently this article and the letters were not to Miss V.'s satisfaction (Ms. V wrote the original letter equating child molestation and homosexuality) so she wrote an article that *ONE* printed in April 1960 further explaining her viewpoint, which was mostly just an anti-homosexual diatribe--she equates homosexuality with child molestation and other sexual compulsion that need to be cured ("Homosexuality as Compared with Child Molestation and Other Compulsions" Apr. 60 *ONE* 5-10). At this point, it seems that the editors were counting on their readers to counter the inflammatory and illogical statements made against homosexuals. They were right. The response to this article was so overwhelming that the editors included a "Readers on Writers" section two months later and continued to print responses in the "Letters" column. Most readers argued against her statements, saying that homosexuality and child molestation are in no way connected and that consensual sexual activity between adults is moral, whereas child molestation is not because there is no possible consent ("Letter from Mr. S" May 60 *ONE* 31; "Letter from Mr. S" Sep. 59 *ONE* 32; "Readers on Writers" Jun. 60 *ONE* 5-10).

The Magazine Belongs to You: Praise and Criticism

The overwhelming majority of letters written to *ONE* were either positive about

the magazine and its articles or made no judgment on it. 51.7% of the letters contained praise for the magazine, 32.4% contained neither praise nor criticism, and only 15.9% were critical. It could be argued that because the editors were in charge of printing whatever they wanted, it makes sense that the majority of the letters chosen for printing were positive. However, it might just as easily be argued that, especially for the first few years of publication, homosexuals were so happy to have something being written about their lives that was interesting and informative, that they would not have presumed to be critical. Numerous letters support this hypothesis ("Letter from Miss R" Sep. 59 *ONE* 31; "Letter from Mr. W" Apr. 59 *ONE* 29-30;). One letter writer said as much when he comments, "Don't know why anyone bothers to criticize. Whether I like everything in your magazine is not important. You're speaking for me in a way I could never accomplish and I am deeply grateful" ("Letter from Mr. A" Dec. 55 *ONE* 28).

The accolades that *ONE* received were often about a specific article, issue, or even the whole magazine. For example, Mr. V writes, "...was particularly enthused over the article, 'It Just Isn't Natural,' as it not only provided answers to the questions, but backs up the answers with facts, and no one can deny facts" ("Letter from Mr. V" Jan. 58 *ONE* 30). Another says, "May I congratulate you people on the work you are doing. Truly you are fighting a hard bitter battle to support our cause. Slowly, but surely, you will win that battle" (Letter from Mr. K" Jul. 58 *ONE* 29). A minister wrote to *ONE* in response to the January 1955 issue, enthusiastically exclaiming, "I wish I could afford to place *ONE* in the library of every clergyman and seminary in the United States" ("Letter from A California Minister" Mar. 55 *ONE* 42).

Other letters were more personal. Stella Rush (a.k.a. Sten Russell) once explained,

"We only expected ONE to be information and education. It didn't occur to us that people would be hanging on to us like a lifeline" (qtd. in White *Pre-Gay L.A.* 40). From the letters that appeared in *ONE*, though, that is exactly what happened. A man from British Columbia wrote to say, "During five years of happily 'married' life we have had to think out some of our problems such as how we were to live together. The decision to do so openly and without dissembling was made easier by your moral support" ("Letter from Mr. P" Nov. 55 *ONE* 29). Many readers explained that *ONE* helped them accept themselves and be confident ("Letter from Mr. R" Jan. 56 *ONE* 29; "Letter from Mr. J" Aug. & Sep. 56 *ONE* 45; "Letter from Mr. R" Nov. 62 *ONE* 31). The articles and letters supporting the idea that homosexuality can be good, or at least is not shameful, was also an important component of the work of community formation in which *ONE* was involved. In order to want to be part of a group based on a specific interest, people have to want to identify with that group. According to the letters, *ONE* made that possible for many homosexuals.

Of course, *ONE* also received its fair share of criticism. Sometimes the letters were just meant to correct a spelling or factual error ("Letter from Mr. H" Apr. 57 *ONE* 22; "Letter from Rudolf Burkhardt" Sep. 59 *ONE* 30; "Letter from Mr. H" Apr. 62 *ONE* 29). It was very clever that often when *ONE* received criticism of a certain item, they would put that letter back to back with a letter praising the same item. For example, one reader said that their fiction is awful and if they cannot get anything good, they should stop printing it ("Letter from "Ms. N" Jun. & Jul 56 *ONE* 46). This was followed by a letter stating that personally, this writer likes the fiction more than the articles ("Letter from Mr. J" Jun. & Jul 56 *ONE* 46). When their photos, artwork, or advertisements were

too "swish," they were harshly criticized by their conservative constituency ("Letter from New York" May 54 *ONE* 28; "About Those Ads Letters" Nov. 54 *ONE* 25; "Letter from Mr. T" Apr. 58 *ONE* 29). Often a letter writer, on finding a particular piece distasteful would tell *ONE* that they should not have published it ("Letter from Mr. J" Oct. 55 *ONE* 30; "Letter from Miss S" Jul. 61 *ONE* 31). Sometimes there was even backlash from subscribers for items they found particularly distasteful. For example, former editor Irma Wolf (pseudonym Ann Carll Reid), thought the drawing of a nude young sailor they printed in 1963 was in such poor taste that she wrote them out of her will ("Letter from Ann Carll Reid" Dec. 63 *ONE* 30).⁴⁸

Additionally *ONE* received what I have termed "nasty-grams." They printed them, I believe, partially because they were in the habit of printing everything, no matter how negative, and partially because they wanted to make others aware of how homosexuals are treated by ignorant members of the heterosexual majority. One of these letters says, "I just saw some of your thrash [sic]. Don't dare send any more of this rubbish to my home you dirty bums all your kind ought to be tarred & feathered" ("Letter from New York City" Nov. 54 *ONE* 25). The editors humorously replied that he had not given them his name and address so it would be difficult for them to cancel his subscription. A reader from California writes, "I just read your magazine for the first time -- and I want to tell you how horrible you all are. You know very well all homosexuals are men, and there are not any women homosexuals...Why don't you leave the women alone and out of your

⁴⁸ The photo was controversial to many, though it is the first and only time they included a nude drawing, of which I am aware. The controversy for many was that it looked like the sailor was defecating because he was only undressed from the waist down. The author wrote in, after the damage was done unfortunately, to explain that the boy was sitting on a cushion, not a toilet and he cannot believe anyone thought it was so crude ("Letter from Mr. H" Dec. 63 *ONE* 30).

lousy magazine. You don't have any respect" ("Letter from Mrs. B" Oct. 55 *ONE* 27).

Another letter would, today, have been considered hate mail. The man writes:

I happened to come across this magazine today. I found it in his belongings. There's no doubt about it I have a brother who is homosexuals, and I hate his guts for it. He never tried to pull anything on me and better not...I met a few homos not too long ago. They tried to take advantage of me. However, I got in a struggle with two of them. I had a chain wrapped it around both of their queer necks. That's how I feel about fairys, queers, homos--whatever you want to call them...If I ever meet up with any more I'll use my .38 on them. That's what they deserve ("Letter from A Straight Guy" Mar. 60 *ONE* 32).

ONE's editors were careful to publish even disturbing letters because so many people were in the same situation as this man's brother--dealing with families who could become this nasty, or maybe already had, when they were found out. Additionally, societal repression is something that minority groups often form ties around; this was definitely the case for the homophile population.

The Magazine Belongs to You: Support and Suggestions

ONE Magazine relied on their readers more than most commercial magazines who were writing for larger audiences and utilizing paid advertising. They received numerous offers from readers to help. The editors replied to these letters by explaining what their readers could do, even from a distance, to help. First, they could help by sending names of potential subscribers ("Editor's Reply" Jan. 56 *ONE* 29). Additionally, they could send items for the news column which many readers did ("Letter from Mr. S" Jan. 59 *ONE* 29-10; "Letter from Mr. R" and "Letter from Mr. W" Jun. 61 *ONE* 31; "Letter from Mr. T" Jun. 61 *ONE* 30). Sometimes they also asked readers to send them names of professionals who were sympathetic to homosexuality ("Editor's Reply" Aug.

58 *ONE* 30). Donations were the most requested item. The "Letters" column, after a fund drive, was often filled with positive responses from people sending whatever they could to help *ONE* continue its work. One particularly touching example of these numerous letters was from a man who worked as a dish-washer but pledged to send \$10 a month anyway ("Letter from John Fadner" Sep. 58 *ONE* 31).

The readers of *ONE* were not shy with their suggestions either. Some of these suggestions were for changes in the magazine. One reader wanted an article on transvestitism, another asked why there were no articles on homosexual men who marry women and have children, a different reader asked for a regular column on religion, someone else wanted classified ads, and another wrote asking them to make *ONE* a weekly magazine ("Letter from Mr. B" Oct. 58 *ONE* 29; "Letter from Mr. T" Oct. 62 30 *ONE*; "Letter from Mr. S" Jun. 60 *ONE* 31; "Letter from Mr. B" Mar. 62 30; "Letter from Mr. L" Dec. 60 *ONE* 31). Additionally, readers had some innovative ideas for the corporation. Prior to their court case, a reader urged them to take their battle to the Supreme Court (which they did); another reader wanted them to form a lobby to press for changes in law; yet another reader thought that more court battles were the best way to gain their rights; a fourth reader had an idea of how to do it, explaining that two of them should confess to having committed illegal "crimes against nature" in the privacy of their own home, thus daring the courts to either prosecute them or change the laws ("Letter from Mr. A" Oct. & Nov. 56 *ONE* 38; "Letter from Mr. R Jun. 62 *ONE* 30; "Letter from Mr. S" Nov. 61 *ONE* 29-30; "Letter from Mr. K" Oct. 63 *ONE* 31). One final idea worth mentioning was that they should publish two more books, one containing their best fiction and another of their articles dealing with the rights of homosexuals ("Letter from

Anon." Jun. 59 *ONE* 29-30).

The Magazine Belongs to You: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly

Often readers wrote letters to share their own stories. These stories tended to fall into three categories: happy/hopeful stories, sad stories, and run-ins with the law stories. The happy stories were a cheerful addition to *ONE*. A reader from Kansas admitted to being anti-homosexual and ignorant before someone gave him a copy of *ONE* and he hoped that his changed outlook would help him reconcile with his estranged gay son ("Letter from Mr. K" Aug. 55 *ONE* 27). Another letter was from a man who fell in love while he was in the service and is still with his partner, living a happy life and (after many conversations) they were accepted by their families ("Letter from Mr. H" Apr. 58 *ONE* 28-29). Yet another letter was from the mother of a gay son. She wrote to say that after she found out about him, she and her husband opened their home to his friends. She commented, "My husband and I have a large three-story house and are filling our house with Gay boys. So far we have six who are rooming and boarding with us. The people I have known so far of the Gay World are wonderful, talented, fascinating people" ("Letter from Mrs. R" Aug. 58 *ONE* 29). One reader wrote to encourage other men who had been discharged from the military, explaining that it happened to him but he was able to find a job and move past it. Additionally, he observes that they are not alone, writing, "I was one of three hundred and fifty discharged at the same time, so there must be a lot of men with U.D. discharges running around" ("Letter from Mr. S" Mar. 61 *ONE* 29).

Two of the more depressing stories that were published in the "Letters" section were from men who ended up alone. The first relates:

"At an early age I was different from other boys and my queerness has carried me all over the U.S.A. in forty years of roaming...Always I seemed to be chasing rainbows, meeting so-called friends who always turned out to be scheming enemies. My years of dabbling in Pen Pal-ism brought me nothing but heartaches. Now, I don't have a friend in the world aside from my dog. I'm alone in my house by the side of the road, keeping busy in my garden" ("Letter from Mr. E" Dec. 62 *ONE* 30).

His story echoes many of the complaints found in the reader's letters: disillusionment with bar life, few options to meet others who share his interests, and loneliness. Another sad letter was from a man who also met his partner while in the Service and they were "married." However, his partner cheated on him numerous times and left him for a "society physician with lots of money" ("Letter from Mr. J" Sep. 62 *ONE* 29). His letter is reminiscent of the idea that "homosexual marriage" is very difficult, but it also connects with other letters urging homosexuals to realize that heterosexuals are not even happy in their marriages and they should not be too naive with their hopes for "homosexual marriages" ("Letter from Miss V" Mar. 60 *ONE* 30; "Letter from Mr. H" Mar. 60 *ONE* 30).

Finally, there were stories of people who had difficulty with the criminal justice system. After being released from jail, one reader wrote to say that he was now their biggest supporter. He reported that he had been arrested for an attempted pick-up. He was sentenced to a year in jail, with five years probation, and mandatory psychiatric treatment. Additionally, he was kept in solitary confinement for four months in order to protect the other prisoners and pointed out that, ironically, his meals were served by a convicted murderer ("Letter from Mr. H" May 59 *ONE* 29). A different reader was arrested after letting a friend bring strangers to a party he hosted. He had to pay a fine and legal fees, and do two years of mandatory counseling. He explained that the judge

threatened to send him to prison for life if he was arrested again and he claimed he would never again act on his sexual inclinations ("Letter from Mr. B" Jun. 63 *ONE* 29-30). As terrible as these stories are, it was important that they were printed because *ONE*'s readers needed to understand how insecure were their rights and how unfair was the treatment that they often received. Mostly, they need to understand how important it was for them to rally together to make changes to the system.

Take *ONE* Down and Pass It Around

Before concluding, it should be noted that the letters section is where a great deal of evidence that *ONE*'s circulation was larger than their subscription numbers can account for comes from. They received letters from all over the United States and the world about friends who shared copies of the magazine ("Letter from Mr. W" Mar. 56 *ONE* 30; "Letter from Mr. P" Dec. 57 *ONE* 31; "Letter from Mr. P" Oct. 58 *ONE* 29). One reader even said that he found a copy his copy of *ONE* in a drawer in a South African hotel ("Letter from Mr. F" Oct. 59 *ONE* 29). Another mentioned that when he finishes reading *ONE*, he leaves the issue on the back seat of his taxi and it is always picked up by someone ("Letter from M.R." Apr. 63 *ONE* 30). It is impossible to say just how many men and women read *ONE* while it was being published, but the numbers are much larger than can be accounted for.

Conclusion

ONE magazine would not have been complete without the many letters from its readers. Their letters showed that often readers were concerned with the same issues as

ONE's editors when it came to religion, marriage, love, etc. Sometimes the letters showed that they had other concerns, like extreme loneliness, that the magazine was not adequately addressing or that they felt more concern over an issue, like "swish." The letters were the means through which *ONE*'s readers could talk back to the editors and contributors. Often this was the only "conversation" available to them with other members of their minority group. The readers were thankful, sometimes critical, full of ideas, and often forthcoming with their life stories. Many of the readers were connected to *ONE* in a very personal way; it was a friend, a salve for loneliness, and link to other homophiles. It seems safe to conclude that the readers did consider *ONE* their magazine. The readers' investment in a magazine that was specifically written for homosexuals is another indicator that a shared identity was beginning to emerge. Unlike a magazine on hotrods or fishing, *ONE* helped homophiles see that there were other people whose lives and deepest concerns were similar. Readers could learn that someone from Australia felt just as lonely as they did in New York or someone in Florida could learn that another homophile in Washington State had also been condemned by a priest. There is no doubt that the readers' letters were fundamental to a blossoming homosexual community.

CONCLUSION

This study began with the purpose of identifying themes found in *ONE* magazine that other scholars considered important while also identifying themes that may have been overlooked. Though this is a qualitative study, I quantified the proportional contribution of each theme to the overall make-up of the magazine in the given time period. No other study has attempted to determine how many articles were written on the seven topics identified, nor has any research determined what proportion of the magazine's contents related to each theme. Still, scholars such as Altman, D'Emilio, Streitmatter, Meeker, White, and Master all discussed important aspects of this magazine. Of these scholars, D'Emilio, Streitmatter and Master took special notice of two topics that my research shows really did dominate the discussions in *ONE*: What is the homosexual's relationship to societal authorities; and, should homosexuals embrace "swish" behavior? Together these themes account for 35% of *ONE*'s non-fiction content.

Furthermore, the framework created by these scholars was used in the analysis presented here: the idea that *ONE* magazine was a contributing factor to a growing sense of community, or shared identity among homosexual men and women in the United States. This study has shown that the content of *ONE* did not unequivocally support the burgeoning theory of homosexual identity. Still, *ONE*'s disputes with societal authorities, the most discussed topic in *ONE*, were certainly important to this growth of community. Furthermore, the other topics presented in this study, though they have not been given

enough attention, were also important to building a community.

This thesis has shown that the staff and contributors of *ONE*, along with its readers, were very interested in discussing religion, especially the homosexual's relationship to Christian churches. Homosexuals often felt rejected and persecuted when they tried to become involved with churches, which only made some of them try harder to reconcile homosexuality with Christian ideology. On the other hand, organized religion has been a societal force that has often brought people together in a unified community, and the fact that homosexuals were denied membership in their churches may have served to push them closer to each other, as Dr. Thompson suggested. It is clear that a number of men and women with same sex tendencies had made the decision that organized religion was not worth their time.

This study was also able to identify a high level of uncertainty that *ONE*'s staff, writers, and readers felt about how they fit into the very conservative, traditional American society of the 1950s and early 60s. Writers responded to the question of whether or not homosexuals should marry heterosexuals to blend into society better. Other contributors and readers thought that homosexuals should "marry" each other, but once this decision was made they often had no idea how to meet other homosexuals who wanted to make the same choice. Still other articles and letters suggested that homosexuals are different than heterosexuals and should not try to copy their mating patterns; instead, they should come up with their own arrangements. It is a shame that no other scholars have yet discussed these conversations, as they led directly to some of the questions the LGBTQI community is asking today.

ONE's readers also deserve recognition for the contributions they made to the

discussions of the themes identified in this study. The readers shared many of the same concerns as the staff and contributors to *ONE* regarding religious issues, marriage, family, and dissatisfaction with "gay bars." However, this study also uncovered notable differences between the readers' letters and the contributors' articles when the topic of loneliness and "swish" behavior arose. On the whole, readers were much more negative toward men and women who exhibited non-stereotypical gender appearance and behavior. They were also much more adamant that more venues become available through which they could meet each other.

The results of this study make clear that *ONE* was not just a magazine that disputed psychiatric, legal, and media misinformation, though this is how much of the literature makes it seem. *ONE* did much more. It allowed the homosexual population of the United States, and many other countries, to discuss numerous facets of their lives. Had *ONE* simply been a medium of protest, it is doubtful that it would have been so engaging to its readers. The reason that the letters *ONE* received were mostly positive is because it created a forum for conversations about topics that were close to readers' hearts. Mandy Carter, a social justice activist from North Carolina, once explained that to make change, you have to win people's hearts and minds (Carter). *ONE* magazine changed people's minds and won their hearts by allowing different "truths" to be openly discussed.

The story of *ONE*'s "truth" is still incomplete. There were topics that I chose not to discuss. As previously stated, two of the topics ("swish" behavior, and push back against societal authorities) have already been discussed thoroughly by scholars such as D'Emilio and Master. The question of what causes homosexuality has been so fraught

with controversy over the years that I expected it would be a significant theme in *ONE*; however, it was actually the smallest proportion of *ONE*'s content for the themes I analyzed, so I chose not to discuss it. Still, it is a product of its time and the theories discussed have historical value. Additionally, I chose not to discuss the theme of homosexuals' connection with one another across time and distance. I believe that *ONE*'s editors included many of these articles and letters from other countries to illustrate to their readers that they are not alone. Individuals with same sex tendencies have existed as long as history has been recorded, so there is reason to presume they existed always; and, they can be found all over the world. There is comfort in that knowledge. This is a topic that should be considered in future scholarship. I also think that *ONE*'s covers and the cover stories would make a fascinating study, as would their advertisements. Additionally, as I have already mentioned, their fiction should be studied. Finally, despite intentions to do so, the representation and impact of women's contribution to *ONE* was not discussed. Because only 2.69% of the articles concerned women, focus for this thesis was placed on the unexplored themes with greater representation in *ONE*. However, future research should definitely examine the impact of women (or lack thereof) on the content and direction of *ONE*.

Undoubtedly, *ONE* was an early driving force in the homophile movement, bringing together a diverse set of people sharing a common aspect of their lives. It generated a lively discussion with differing viewpoints, especially regarding the role of religion in homosexuals' lives and how the homosexual person could exist in and relate to a conservative society. Though fraught with a myriad of issues, it served as an early catalyst for societal change that is still taking place today.

REFERENCES

- Adam, Barry D. *The Rise of a Gay and Lesbian Movement*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1987. Print.
- Altman, Dennis. *Homosexual Oppression and Liberation*. New York: New York University Press, 1971. Print.
- Bronski, Michael. *Culture Clash: The Making of Gay Sensibility*. Boston: South End Press, 1984. Print.
- Cain, Paul D. *Leading the Parade: Conversations with America's Most Influential Lesbians and Gay Men*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, Inc., 2002. Print.
- Carter, Mandy. "The Revolutionary Principles of Nonviolence." Let's Talk Lunch. University of Louisville, Louisville, KY. 4 Oct. 2012. Lecture.
- Cutler, Marvin. Ed. *Homosexuals Today*. Los Angeles: Publications Division of ONE, Inc., 1956. Print.
- D'Emilio, John. *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities: The Making of a Homosexual Minority in the United States, 1940-1970*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1983. Print.
- "Finding Aid of the ONE, Inc. Records." *One National Gay and Lesbian Archives*. 2011. Web. 13 Nov. 2012 < <http://cdn.calisphere.org/data/13030/9h/kt7290389h/files/kt7290389h.pdf>>.
- Gross, Larry. *Up From Invisibility*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2001. Print.
- "History." *Tangent Group Online* 2012. Web. 10 Apr. 2013 < <http://tangentgroup.org/>

- mediawiki/index.php/History_Index>.
- Kaiser, Charles. *The Gay Metropolis, 1940-1996*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1997. Print.
- Kepner, Jim. *Rough News—Daring Views: 1950s Pioneer Gay Press Journalism*. New York: The Harrington Park Press, 1998. Print.
- . "The Women of ONE." *Out History*. 2008. Web. 14 Jan. 2013. <http://www.outhistory.org/wiki/The_Women_of_ONE>.
- Legg, W. Dorr. *Homophile Studies in Theory and Practice*. San Francisco: One Institute Press, 1994. Print.
- Loftin, Craig M. "Unacceptable Mannerisms: Gender Anxieties, Homosexual Activism, and Swish in the United States, 1945-1965." *Journal of Social History* 40 (Spring 2007): 577-596. <http://muse.jhu.edu.echo.louisville.edu/journals/journal_of_social_history/v040/40.3loftin.html>.
- Marcus, Eric. *Making History: The Struggle for Gay and Lesbian Equal Rights, 1945-1990*. New York: HarperPerennial, 1992. Print.
- Master, John Denet, II. "A Part of Our Libertaion": *ONE Magazine and the Cultivation of Gay Liberation, 1953-1963*. Diss. University of California Riverside, 2006. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, 2006. Web.
- Meeker, Martin. *Contacts Desired: Gay and Lesbian Communications and Community, 1940s – 1970s*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2006. Print.
- ONE*, January 1954 – December 1963. The Williams Nichols Archive, University of Louisville. Print.

- "ONE National Gay & Lesbian Archives." *One National Gay and Lesbian Archives* 2012. Web. 10 Apr. 2013. <<http://www.onearchives.org/>>.
- Parlour, Richard R. et. al. "The Homophile Movement: Its Impact and Implications." *Journal of Religion and Health* 6 (Jul. 1967): 217-234. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/27504864>>.
- Slater, Don. "Letter from the Homosexual Information Center." *College English* 37 (Sep. 1975): 78-79. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/375311>>.
- Streitmatter, Rodger. *Unspeakable: The Rise of the Gay and Lesbian Press in America*. Boston: Faber and Faber, 1995. Print.
- White, C. Todd. *Pre-Gay L.A.: A Social History of the Movement for Homosexual Rights*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2009. Print.
- . "Pseudonyms." *Out History* 2008. Web. 14 Jan. 2013 <<http://www.outhistory.org/wiki/Pseudonyms>>.

APPENDIX A: PSEUDONYMS

Real Name	Pseudonyms	Source
Ann Holmquist	Ann Bannon	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> Appendix B
Bailey Whitaker	Rene	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> 35
	Guy Rousseau	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> Appendix B
Betty Perdue	Geraldine Jackson	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> 36
Chuck Rowland	David L. Freeman	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> Appendix B
	Don Fry	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> Appendix B
Dale Jennings	Jeff Winters	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> 35
	Elizabeth Lalo	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> Appendix B
	R. Noone	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> Appendix B
	Hieronymous K	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> 36
Don Slater	Gregory James	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> 35
Don Slater & Jack Gibson	Leslie (Lex) Colfax (primarily)	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> 78
Dorr Legg/William Lambert	Marvin Cutler (primarily)	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> 2
	Valentine Richardson	Kepner <i>Rough News</i> 205
	Hollister Barnes	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> 30
	Richard Conger	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> Appendix B
	Alison Hunter (primarily)	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> Appendix B
	Wendy Lane	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> Appendix B
Doyle Eugene Livingston	DEL	ONE, January 1958, pg. 21
Dr. Merritt M. Thompson	T.M. Merritt	Kepner <i>Rough News</i> 6
	Thomas R. Merritt	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> 74
Edward Sagarin	Donald Webster Cory	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> 5
Fred Frisbie	George Mortenson	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> 34
Gerald Heard	D.B. Vest	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> 73
Irma "Corky" Wolf	Ann Carll Reid	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> 34
James Fugate	James Barr	White, "Pseudonyms"
Jean Corbin	Eve Ellore	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> 34

Jim Kepner	Lyn Pedersen	Kepner <i>Rough News</i> 11
	Dal McIntire	Kepner <i>Rough News</i> 11
	Dalvin Arthur McIntire	Kepner <i>Rough News</i> 37
	John or Jane Arnold	White - Appendix B
	Frank Golovitz	Kepner <i>Rough News</i> 11
Joe Weaver	Joe Aaron	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> 98
Johannes Werres	Jack Argo	White, "Pseudonyms"
Joseph Hansen	James Colton	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> Appendix B
Julian Underwood	Robert Gregory (primarily)	Kepner <i>Rough News</i> 6
	R.H. Crowther	Kepner <i>Rough News</i> 6
Mac McNeal	K.O. Neal	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> Appendix B
Mel Brown	David Russell	Kepner <i>Rough News</i> 37
Nancy	Alison Hunter	Kepner, "The Women of ONE"
ONE Editorial Staff	Cal, Del, Hal, Sal, or Val McIntire	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> Appendix B
	Robert Gregory - Editorial Secretary	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> 104
	Ursula Enters Copely	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> Appendix B
	Leslie (Lex) Colfax - Librarian	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> 104
	Marvin Cutler - Dir. of Public Info	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> 104
	Armand Quezon - International Editor	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> 104
	Alisaon Hunter - Women's Editor	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> 104
Ross Ingersoll	Marcell Martin	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> Appendix B
Rudolph Alexander Jung	Rudolph von Burkhardt	White, "Pseudonyms"
Stella Rush	Sten Russell	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> 56
Unknown	Gabrielle Ganelle	White 104, Kepner "The Women of ONE"
	Arthur B. Krell (well-known writer)	The Homosexual Today, 61
	Alice Horvath	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> 104
	W.H. Hamilton	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> 104
William Edward "Billy" Glover	W.E.G. McIntire	White <i>Pre-Gay L.A.</i> Appendix B
Wilna Onthank	Dawn Frederic	Kepner, "The Women of ONE"

APPENDIX B: *ONE*'S ARTICLES

Total Number of Articles Analyzed by Year

<u>Year</u>	<u># of Articles</u>
1954	76
1955	109
1956	58
1957	78
1958	122
1959	109
1960	122
1961	107
1962	98
1963	113
Total	992

Articles Written by *ONE*'s Staff

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number of Articles</u>	<u>% of Articles</u>
1954	24	31.57
1955	34	31.19
1956	21	35.00
1957	29	36.25
1958	49	36.25
1959	48	43.63
1960	40	33.06
1961	34	31.48
1962	41	41.84
1963	35	30.97
Total	358	35.76

Fiction v. Non-Fiction Articles in ONE

<u>Year</u>		<u>Non-Fiction</u>	<u>Fiction</u>
1954	Number of 1954 Articles	49	27
	% of 1954 Articles	64.47	35.53
1955	Number of 1955 Articles	75	34
	% of 1955 Articles	68.81	31.19
1956	Number of 1956 Articles	47	13
	% of 1956 Articles	78.33	21.67
1957	Number of 1957 Articles	63	17
	% of 1957 Articles	78.75	21.25
1958	Number of 1958 Articles	83	40
	% of 1958 Articles	67.48	32.52
1959	Number of 1959 Articles	81	29
	% of 1959 Articles	73.64	26.36
1960	Number of 1960 Articles	81	43
	% of 1960 Articles	65.32	34.68
1961	Number of 1961 Articles	64	44
	% of 1961 Articles	59.26	40.74
1962	Number of 1962 Articles	67	31
	% of 1962 Articles	68.37	31.63
1963	Number of 1963 Articles	68	45
	% of 1963 Articles	60.18	39.82
	Total Number of Articles	678	323
	% of Total Articles	67.73	32.27

Articles Written by Women

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>	<u># by ONE's Staff</u>	<u>% by ONE's Staff</u>
Fiction	90	9.07	6	1.69
Non-Fiction	65	6.55	36	10.14

Conversations Taking Place in ONE's Non-Fiction Articles

	# Engaging in this Conversation	% of Total Articles
What causes homosexuality?	20	2.01
Should homosexuals embrace "swish"?	88	8.87
How were females addressed in ONE?	53	5.34
What is the homosexual's relationship to societal authorities?	284	28.37
What is the role of religion in the homosexual's life?	65	6.55
Are there connections between homosexuals over time and in different cultures?	78	7.79
How does the homosexual fit into society?	62	6.25

What causes homosexuality?

<u>Year</u>	<u># of Articles</u>	<u>% of Articles for the Year</u>	<u># by ONE's Staff</u>	<u>% by ONE's Staff for the Year</u>
1954	2	2.63	0	0.00
1955	4	3.66	2	50.00
1956	0	0.00	0	0.00
1957	1	1.28	0	0.00
1958	2	1.63	1	50.00
1959	3	2.75	3	100.00
1960	3	2.42	3	100.00
1961	0	0.00	0	0.00
1962	1	1.02	1	100.00
1963	4	3.54	0	0.00
Total	20	2.01	10	50.00

Should homosexuals embrace "swish"?

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number of Articles</u>	<u>% of Articles for the Year</u>	<u># by ONE's Staff</u>	<u>% by ONE's Staff for the Year</u>
1954	11	14.47	4	36.36
1955	11	10.09	5	45.45
1956	7	11.67	3	42.85
1957	5	6.41	2	40.00
1958	12	9.76	10	83.33
1959	10	9.17	7	70.00
1960	8	6.55	5	62.5
1961	9	8.41	4	44.44
1962	10	10.20	4	40.00
1963	5	4.42	2	40.00
Total	88	8.87	46	52.27

How were females addressed in ONE?

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number of Articles</u>	<u>% of Articles for the Year</u>	<u># by ONE's Staff</u>	<u>% by ONE's Staff for the Year</u>
1954	4	5.26	1	25.00
1955	5	4.59	4	80.00
1956	3	5.17	2	66.66
1957	4	5.00	2	50.00
1958	10	8.19	7	70.00
1959	9	8.25	5	55.55
1960	5	4.03	3	60.00
1961	1	0.93	1	100.00
1962	9	9.18	6	66.66
1963	3	2.65	1	33.33
Total	53	5.34	32	60.37

What is the homosexuals relationship to societal authorities?

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number of Articles</u>	<u>% of Articles for the Year</u>	<u># by ONE's Staff</u>	<u>% by ONE's Staff for the Year</u>
1954	25	32.89	15	60.00
1955	35	32.11	18	51.42
1956	18	30.00	13	72.22
1957	29	36.25	21	72.41
1958	26	21.14	22	84.61
1959	35	31.82	30	85.71
1960	30	24.19	22	73.33
1961	24	22.22	19	79.16
1962	28	28.57	23	82.14
1963	34	30.09	23	67.64
Total	284	28.37	206	72.53

What is the role of religion in the homosexual's life?

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number of Articles</u>	<u>% of Articles for the Year</u>	<u># by ONE's Staff</u>	<u>% by ONE's Staff for the Year</u>
1954	7	9.21	4	57.14
1955	3	2.75	3	100.00
1956	3	5.17	3	100.00
1957	8	10.00	4	50.00
1958	7	5.69	3	42.85
1959	3	2.73	2	66.66
1960	13	10.48	3	23.07
1961	1	0.93	1	100.00
1962	6	6.12	1	16.66
1963	14	12.39	7	50.00
Total	65	6.55	31	47.69

Are there connections between homosexuals over time and in different cultures?

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number of Articles</u>	<u>% of Articles for the Year</u>	<u># by ONE's Staff</u>	<u>% by ONE's Staff for the Year</u>
1954	2	2.63	2	100.00
1955	15	13.76	7	46.66
1956	10	16.67	4	40.00
1957	8	10.00	3	37.50
1958	13	10.57	5	38.46
1959	4	3.64	1	25.00
1960	7	5.65	3	42.85
1961	7	6.48	4	57.14
1962	3	3.06	1	33.33
1963	9	7.96	4	44.44
Total	78	7.79	34	43.58

How does the homosexual fit into society?

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number of Articles</u>	<u>% of Articles for the Year</u>	<u># by ONE's Staff</u>	<u>% by ONE's Staff for the Year</u>
1954	1	1.32	0	0.00
1955	5	4.59	2	40.00
1956	1	1.67	1	100.00
1957	2	2.50	1	50.00
1958	8	6.55	5	62.50
1959	14	12.73	9	64.28
1960	7	5.65	1	14.28
1961	9	8.33	5	55.55
1962	10	10.20	2	20.00
1963	5	4.42	1	20.00
Total	62	6.25	27	43.5

APPENDIX C: BOOK REVIEWS

Reviewers Perception

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Positive	128	64.65
Negative	64	32.32
Neutral	6	3.03

Types of Media Reviewed

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Article	2	1.01
Biography/Auto	15	7.58
Biography/Memoir		
Fiction	106	53.54
Film	2	1.01
Film/Play	4	2.02
Journal	2	1.01
Journal/Periodical	2	1.01
Non-Fiction	61	30.81
Poetry	3	1.52
Unknown	1	0.51
Total	198	100.00

APPENDIX D: *ONE'S* LETTERS

Total Letters Reviewed from January 1954-December 1963: **1261**

Letters from U.S. States (not including letters where the state of origin was unavailable)

<u>State</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent of Total</u> <u>Letters</u>
California	257	20.38
New York	239	18.95
Texas	56	4.44
Pennsylvania	51	4.04
Illinois	44	3.49
Massachusetts	37	2.93
Florida	33	2.62
Michigan	33	2.62
Washington DC	31	2.46
Ohio	29	2.30
New Jersey	27	2.14
Indiana	25	1.98
Washington	25	1.98
Missouri	24	1.90
Kansas	19	1.51
Connecticut	18	1.43
Virginia	12	0.95
Georgia	11	0.87
Louisiana	11	0.87
Iowa	10	0.79
Maryland	10	0.79
Wisconsin	10	0.79
Arizona	9	0.71
Utah	9	0.71
Colorado	8	0.63
Alaska	7	0.56
Nebraska	6	0.48
Vermont	6	0.48
Oregon	5	0.40
Delaware	4	0.32
Minnesota	4	0.32

Montana	4	0.32
New Hampshire	4	0.32
North Carolina	4	0.32
Oklahoma	4	0.32
South Carolina	4	0.32
Wyoming	4	0.32
Alabama	3	0.24
Arkansas	3	0.24
Hawaii	3	0.24
Idaho	3	0.24
Tennessee	3	0.24
West Virginia	3	0.24
Kentucky	2	0.16
Maine	1	0.08
Mississippi	1	0.08
New Mexico	1	0.08
South Dakota	1	0.08
Nevada		
North Dakota		
Rhode Island		
TOTAL	1118	88.66

Letters from Outside of the U.S.

<u>Country</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent of All Letters Printed</u>	<u>% of Non- U.S. Letters</u>
Canada	48	3.81	35.29
England	19	1.51	13.97
Australia	13	1.03	9.56
France	7	0.56	5.15
Switzerland	6	0.48	4.41
South Africa	5	0.40	3.68
Germany	4	0.32	2.94
Denmark	3	0.24	2.21
Holland	3	0.24	2.21
Italy	3	0.24	2.21
Sweden	3	0.24	2.21
Argentina	2	0.16	1.47
Belgium	2	0.16	1.47
India	2	0.16	1.47
Japan	2	0.16	1.47
New Zealand	2	0.16	1.47

Norway	2	0.16	1.47
West Germany	2	0.16	1.47
Ceylon	1	0.08	0.74
Colombia	1	0.08	0.74
Iceland	1	0.08	0.74
Ireland	1	0.08	0.74
Malaysia	1	0.08	0.74
Morocco	1	0.08	0.74
Papua New Guinea	1	0.08	0.74
Scotland	1	0.08	0.74
TOTAL	136	10.79	100

Reader Responses to ONE or the Articles it Printed

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Positive Comments	652	51.7
Negative Comment	201	15.9
Neutral Comments	408	32.4

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Responding to an Article	430	34.0
Responding to another Reader Letter	84	6.66

Important Themes in the Letters

	# Engaging in this Conversation	% of Total Letters
What causes homosexuality?	32	2.53
Should homosexuals embrace "swish"?	137	10.86
How were females addressed in ONE?	34	2.69
What is the homosexuals relationship to societal authorities?	307	24.34
What is the role of religion in the homosexual's life?	121	9.59
Are there connections between homosexuals over time and in different cultures?	78	6.18
How does the homosexual fit into society?	155	12.29
<i>What can the homosexual do to combat loneliness?</i>	93	7.37

*"What can the homosexual do to combat loneliness?" is a subset of the "How does the homosexual fit into society?" theme. The 155 includes the 93 "lonely" letters.

APPENDIX E - NON-FICTION ARTICLES V. LETTERS

Conversations Taking Place in the Letters to the Editors & Articles

	# of Letters Engaging in this Conversation	% of Total Letters	# of Articles Engaging in this Conversation	% of Total Articles
What causes homosexuality?	32	2.53	20	2.01
Should homosexuals embrace "swish"?	137	10.86	88	8.87
How were females addressed in ONE?	34	2.69	53	5.34
What is the homosexuals relationship to societal authorities?	307	24.34	284	28.37
What is the role of religion in the homosexual's life?	121	9.59	65	6.55
Are there connections between homosexuals over time and in different cultures?	78	6.18	78	7.79
How does the homosexual fit into society?	155	12.29	62	6.25
<i>What can the homosexual do to combat loneliness?</i>	93	7.37		

*"What can the homosexual do to combat loneliness?" is a subset of the "How does the homosexual fit into society?" theme. The 155 includes the 93 "lonely" letters.

Differences between the reactions toward "Swish" in the Articles and Letters (Positive and negative totals do not include letters or articles with a neutral stance on "swish")

	Positive Toward "Swish"	Negative Toward "Swish"	% of Total Positive	% of Total Negative
Letters (137)	45	92	32.84	67.15
Articles (88)	38	44	43.18	50.00

CURRICULUM VITAE

Alisha West
1101 Lady's Slipper Ct, Apt C, Raleigh, NC 27606
509.396.4840
adwest03@cardmail.louisville.edu

EDUCATION

University of Louisville, Louisville, KY

Master of Arts in Women and Gender Studies 2013

Gonzaga University, Spokane, WA

Bachelor of Arts in English, with concentrations in
Political Science and Women's and Gender Studies 2010

Spokane Community College, Spokane, WA

Associate of Arts in Liberal Arts 2003

AWARDS

2012 Carolyn Krause Maddox Prize in Women's and Gender Studies for
"The Absence of Socialist-Feminism in the Pornography Debates" 2012

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Spokane Community College, Spokane, WA

Tutor– Political Science 2002

University of Louisville

Guest Lecturer– Women's and Gender Studies 2011-2012

RELATED EXPERIENCE

University of Louisville, Women's and Gender Studies Department

Graduate Assistant 2011-present

- Creator and Editor of *Bend*, the Official Newsletter of the Women's & Gender Studies Department
- Community outreach in representation of the department

- Help WGS undergraduate seniors find placement in community internships
- Planning fall and spring student community-building activities
- Public Relations/Marketing for the annual Minx Auerbach lecture

University of Louisville, Anne Braden Institute for Social Justice Research

Graduate Assistant

2011-present

- Represent ABI at campus and community events such as Take Back the Night, Day of the Dead, Pride Week, the Bioneer's Fair, and the Vagina Monologues
- Plan and take part in meetings of the "Meeting of the Minds" group
- Take part in meetings of the "White Allies for Racial Justice" group
- Planning committee for the "Martin Luther King Jr. Day of Service"
- Planning committee lead for the "International Women's Day Celebration 2012"

Gonzaga University, Office of Admission

Academic Records Evaluator/Computer Operations Technician

2003-2010

- Working knowledge of the SCT Banner database; running FOCUS and other custom reports; downloading online applications and inquiries; reviewing release guides for upgrades and testing changes; maintenance of Admissions tables; testing new data and processes; gatekeeper for security access to Admissions tables and forms for Admissions staff and students.
- Assistant lead for document imaging implementation. Experience with creating workflows and forms.
- Maintain and create a written policies and procedures manual concerning all projects for which I am responsible.
- Graduate admissions coordinator which includes maintaining the main graduate admissions website and running the Admissions Team Meeting.
- Attend staff meetings, Student Team meetings, and Staff Assembly meetings.
- Elected member of the Staff Assembly Executive Council.
- Subscribe to and monitor list serves for admissions software.

PUBLICATIONS AND PAPERS

- "The Cunt Manifesto"
The Fringe, Gonzaga University's Women's and Gender Studies Journal, Spring 2010.
- "Oil Makes the World Go 'Round"
Charter, Gonzaga University's Journal of Scholarship and Opinion, Fall 2009.
- "National Susan B. Anthony Day Anyone?"
The Feminist Papers, Gonzaga University's Women's and Gender Studies Journal, Spring 2009.

INVITED PRESENTATIONS

- "The Prostitution Debate." January 12, 2012. (Panelist) Cards 4 Freedom, A Student Organization Against Human Trafficking. University of Louisville. Louisville, KY.
- "The Absence of Socialist Feminism in the Pornography Debates." Paper presented at the Carolyn Krause Maddox Colloquium for Women's History Month. University of Louisville. Louisville, KY.

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

- "To Be or Not to Be: Is that Your Question?"
Come Together Kentucky Conference for LGBTQIA Students, Louisville, KY, March 2012.
- "My First Relay"
Florida Division Summit Conference for the American Cancer Society's Relay for Life, Orlando, FL, August 2009.

ORGANIZATIONS

- National Women's Studies Association, 2012-present
- Feminist Alliance, Club Leader, 2011-present